

Scotland's Rural College

Prediction of enteric methane production, yield and intensity of beef cattle using an intercontinental database

van Lingen, Henk; Niu, Mutian; Kebreab, Ermias ; Valadares Filho, Sebastião ; Rooke, JA; Duthie, C-A; Schwarm, Angela ; Kreuzer, Michael ; Hynd, Phil ; Caetano, Mariana ; Eugène, Maguy ; Martin, Cécile ; McGee, Mark ; O'Kiely, Pádraig ; Hünerberg, Martin ; McAllister, Tim ; Berchielli, Telma ; Messana, Juliana ; Peiren, Nico ; Chaves, Alex ; Charmley, Ed ; Cole, Andy ; Hales, Kristin ; Lee, Sang-Suk ; Berndt, Alexandre ; Reynolds, Christopher ; Crompton, Les ; Bayat, Ali-Reza ; Yáñez-Ruiz, David ; Yu, Zhongtang ; Bannink, André ; Dijkstra, Jan ; Casper, David ; Hristov, Alexander

Published in:
Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment

DOI:
[10.1016/j.agee.2019.106575](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2019.106575)

Print publication: 01/11/2019

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

van Lingen, H., Niu, M., Kebreab, E., Valadares Filho, S., Rooke, JA., Duthie, C-A., Schwarm, A., Kreuzer, M., Hynd, P., Caetano, M., Eugène, M., Martin, C., McGee, M., O'Kiely, P., Hünerberg, M., McAllister, T., Berchielli, T., Messana, J., Peiren, N., ... Hristov, A. (2019). Prediction of enteric methane production, yield and intensity of beef cattle using an intercontinental database. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, 283, [106575]. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2019.106575>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Title

Prediction of enteric methane production, yield and intensity of beef cattle using an intercontinental database

Running Head

Predicting enteric methane from beef cattle

Author List

Henk J. van Lingen^{a,*}, Mutian Niu^{a,b}, Ermias Kebreab^a, Sebastião C. Valadares Filho^c, John A. Rooke^d, Carol-Anne Duthie^d, Angela Schwarm^{e,1}, Michael Kreuzer^e, Phil I. Hynd^f, Mariana Caetano^f, Maguy Eugène^g, Cécile Martin^g, Mark McGee^h, Pádraig O'Kiely^h, Martin Hünerberg^{i,j}, Tim A. McAllisterⁱ, Telma T. Berchielli^k, Juliana D. Messana^k, Nico Peiren^l, Alex V. Chaves^m, Ed Charmleyⁿ, N. Andy Cole^o, Kristin E. Hales^p, Sang-Suk Lee^q, Alexandre Berndt^r, Christopher K. Reynolds^s, Les A. Crompton^s, Ali-Reza Bayat^t, David R. Yáñez-Ruiz^u, Zhongtang Yu^v, André Bannink^w, Jan Dijkstra^x, David P. Casper^y, Alexander N. Hristov^z.

^aDepartment of Animal Science, University of California, Davis, CA 95616, USA; ^bFarmer's Business Network Inc., San Carlos, CA 94070, USA; ^cAnimal Science Department, Universidade Federal de Viçosa, Viçosa, Minas Gerais, Brazil; ^dSRUC, West Mains Road, Edinburgh EH9 3JG, UK; ^eETH Zurich, Institute of Agricultural Sciences, 8092 Zürich, Switzerland; ^fDepartment of Animal and Veterinary Bioscience, The University of Adelaide, Roseworthy Campus, Roseworthy, SA 5371, Australia; ^gINRA, UMR Herbivores, VetAgro Sup, Université Clermont Auvergne, F-63122 Saint-Genès-Champanelle, France; ^hTeagasc, Grange, Dunsany, Co. Meath, Ireland; ⁱDepartment of Agricultural, Food and Nutritional Science, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada; ^jLethbridge Research and Development Centre, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, Lethbridge, AB, Canada; ^kAnimal Science Department, São Paulo State University, UNESP, Jaboticabal, SP 14884-900, Brazil; ^lFlanders Research Institute for Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, Animal Sciences Unit, Scheldeweg 68, Melle 9090, Belgium; ^mThe University of Sydney, Faculty of Science, School of Life and Environmental Sciences, Sydney, NSW, Australia; ⁿCSIRO Agriculture and Food, Private Mail Bag, PO Aitkenvale, Qld 4814, Australia; ^oUSDA-ARS, Bushland, TX 79012; ^pUSDA-ARS, Clay Center, NE 68933; ^qDepartment of Animal Science and Technology, Sunchon National University, Suncheon, South Korea; ^rResearch and Development, EMBRAPA Southeast Livestock, Rod Washington Luiz, km 234, PO Box 339, 13560-970 Sao Carlos, SP, Brazil; ^sSchool of Agriculture, Policy and Development, University of Reading, Reading, UK; ^tMilk Production, Production Systems, Natural Resources Institute Finland (Luke), Jokioinen, Finland; ^uEstación Experimental del Zaidin (CSIC), Granada, Spain; ^vDepartment of Animal Sciences, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, USA; ^wWageningen Livestock Research, Wageningen University & Research, Wageningen, The Netherlands; ^xAnimal Nutrition Group, Wageningen University & Research, Wageningen, The Netherlands; ^yFurst McNess Company, Freeport, IL, 61032, USA; ^zDepartment of Animal Science, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park 16802.

* Corresponding Author.

E-mail address: hjvanlingen@ucdavis.edu

¹ Present address: Department of Animal and Aquacultural Sciences, Norwegian University of Life Sciences, 1433 Ås, Norway

Abstract

Enteric methane (CH₄) production attributable to beef cattle contributes to global greenhouse gas emissions. Reliably estimating this contribution requires extensive CH₄ emission data from beef cattle under different management conditions worldwide. The objectives were to: 1) predict CH₄ production (g d⁻¹ animal⁻¹), yield [g (kg dry matter intake; DMI)⁻¹] and intensity [g (kg average daily gain)⁻¹] using an intercontinental database (data from Europe, North America, Brazil, Australia and South Korea); 2) assess the impact of geographic region, and of higher- and lower-forage diets. Linear models were developed by incrementally adding covariates. A *K*-fold cross-validation indicated that a CH₄ production equation using only DMI that was fitted to all available data had a root mean square prediction error (RMSPE; % of observed mean) of 31.2%. Subsets containing data with ≥ 25% and ≤ 18% dietary forage contents had an RMSPE of 30.8 and 34.2%, with the all-data CH₄ production equation, whereas these errors decreased to 29.3 and 28.4%, respectively, when using CH₄ prediction equations fitted to these subsets. The RMSPE of the ≥ 25% forage subset further decreased to 24.7% when using multiple regression. Europe- and North America-specific subsets predicted by the best performing ≥ 25% forage multiple regression equation had RMSPE of 24.5 and 20.4%, whereas these errors were 24.5 and 20.0% with region-specific equations, respectively. The developed equations had less RMSPE than extant equations evaluated for all data (22.5 vs. 23.2%), for higher-forage (21.2 vs. 23.1%), but not for the lower-forage subsets (28.4 vs. 27.9%). Splitting the dataset by forage content did not improve CH₄ yield or intensity predictions. Predicting beef cattle CH₄ production using energy conversion factors, as applied by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change,

70 indicated that adequate forage content-based and region-specific energy conversion factors
71 improve prediction accuracy and are preferred in national or global inventories.

72

73 **Keywords:** empirical modeling, geographical region, forage content, dietary variables, methane
74 emission

1. Introduction

The livestock sector emits about 7.1 gigatonnes of CO₂ equivalents of greenhouse gases per year, which represented approximately 14.5% of total global anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions in 2005 (Gerber *et al.*, 2013). Cattle emitted 4.6 gigatonnes CO₂ equivalents, of which 2.5 gigatonnes originated from beef and 2.1 gigatonnes from dairy cattle, whereas small ruminants and buffalos emitted 0.47 and 0.62 gigatonnes CO₂ equivalents, respectively. Methane from enteric fermentation contributed about 45% of the combined CO₂ equivalents emissions from the two cattle types. World-wide beef cattle systems produced 35 million tonnes of meat, whereas dairy cattle systems produced 27 million tonnes. Meat protein greenhouse gas emission intensity from beef cattle, and combined meat and milk protein intensity from dairy cattle vary from about 200 to 1100, and 50 to 350 kg CO₂ equivalents per kg edible protein, respectively, depending on the region of the world (Opio *et al.*, 2013). Based on expected farming and consumer lifestyle practices and the predicted world population growth, compared to 1995, global enteric CH₄ emissions are predicted to increase by 70% by 2055 (Popp *et al.*, 2010). To offset this increase and to deal with the highly variable and typically greater CH₄ emission intensity of beef cattle systems, accurate prediction of beef cattle CH₄ emissions across regions are urgently required.

Various beef cattle CH₄ prediction equations, for which a variety of diet and animal characteristics were used as covariates, based on treatments means (*e.g.*, Ellis *et al.*, 2009; Escobar-Bahamondes *et al.*, 2017a) or individual animal data (Ellis *et al.*, 2007; Moraes *et al.*, 2014) have been published. Although the use of individual animal data as applied in the latter two studies contributes to more explained variation of CH₄ production due to dry matter intake (DMI) differences at the animal level, all previously mentioned studies only comprised data from

specific geographical locations. In contrast to these equations, which may be appropriate for cattle systems under similar regional conditions, the widely used Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) methodology recommends a generic CH₄ energy conversion factor (Y_m) without any adjustment for different geographical locations (IPCC, 2014). The Y_m quantifies enteric CH₄ emission as a fraction of the gross energy intake and discriminates between diets with forage contents of ≤ 10 and $> 10\%$ DM, with Y_m being 3.0% and 6.5% of the gross energy intake, respectively. However, more complex equations accounting for dietary nutrient composition and individual animal characteristics in addition to total feed intake may perform better than those that ignore these covariates for various cattle categories (Ellis *et al.*, 2007, 2009; Moraes *et al.*, 2014; Santiago-Suarez *et al.*, 2016). Therefore, more complex beef cattle CH₄ prediction equations that draw from databases with a broad range of diets and geographic conditions may more accurately predict global CH₄ emissions. Publications of inventories that investigated cattle enteric CH₄ emissions in certain countries or regions (*e.g.*, Basarab *et al.*, 2005; Kebreab *et al.*, 2008; Bannink *et al.*, 2011; Castelan-Ortega *et al.*, 2014; Charmley *et al.*, 2016) compared to an intercontinental evaluation (*e.g.*, Niu *et al.*, 2018) confirm the utility of the latter approach.

The objectives of the current study were: 1) to collate an intercontinental database of enteric CH₄ production of individual animal records of beef cattle; 2) to determine the key variables for predicting beef cattle enteric CH₄ production ($\text{g d}^{-1} \text{ animal}^{-1}$), yield [g (kg DMI)^{-1}] and intensity [$\text{g (kg average daily body weight gain)}^{-1}$] and their respective relationships; 3) to develop and cross-validate intercontinental and region-specific models, and models for lower- and higher-forage diets.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Database

The ‘GLOBAL NETWORK’ project is an international collaborative initiative of animal scientists (<http://animalscience.psu.edu/fnn>; accessed May 16, 2017). All animal scientists with an interest in greenhouse gas research and with access to CH₄ measurements from beef cattle were invited to collaborate and contribute data to this collaborative CH₄ mitigation data analysis. The resultant beef cattle CH₄ database that was developed from this initiative contains 2015 individual beef cattle records from 52 studies conducted from 1969 to 2015 by research entities from Europe ($n = 869$ from 18 studies), North America ($n = 649$ from 14 studies), Brazil ($n = 313$ from 12 studies), Australia ($n = 174$ from 7 studies) and South Korea ($n = 10$ from 1 study). The European studies were conducted in the UK ($n = 313$ from 7 studies), Switzerland ($n = 96$ from 1 study), Belgium ($n = 72$ from 4 studies), Ireland ($n = 147$ from 2 studies) and France ($n = 241$ from 4 studies). Eleven North American studies were from the United States ($n = 492$), and 3 were conducted in Canada ($n = 157$). The database includes records of enteric CH₄ production along with corresponding DMI, dietary gross energy, crude protein, ether extract (EE), neutral detergent fiber (NDF), starch, ash and forage contents, average daily body weight gain (ADG) and body weight (BW). The database comprised a broad variety of beef cattle that included growing and finishing steers, bulls and heifers, pregnant heifers, and pregnant, non-pregnant, dry and lactating beef cows. Various pure beef breeds and crossbreeds were included, *viz.*, Aberdeen Angus, Blonde d’Aquitaine, Belgian Blue, Brahman, Brown Swiss × Limousin, Charolais, Hanwoo, Holstein × Zebu, Hereford × Angus, Luing and Nellore.

The original studies in the database (complete data bibliography is provided in Supplementary information) investigated the impact of diet composition on enteric CH₄

production or cattle metabolism. However, some studies tested the effect of a specific feed additive, nutrient or the use of hormone supplementation, and the data from these treatments were excluded. The excluded treatments included rapeseed cake and nitrate (Troy *et al.*, 2015), limestone (Zanetti *et al.*, 2017), Acacia tannins, maca, garlic and lupine seeds (Staerfl *et al.*, 2012), monensin (Caetano *et al.*, 2016, 2018), organosulfur compounds (garlic extracts) (Peiren *et al.*, unpublished) and essential oils (Castro Montoya *et al.*, 2015), lipids (Duthie *et al.*, 2015), dried corn distillers grains (Hünerberg *et al.*, 2013ab), linseed oil and protected fat (Fiorentini *et al.*, 2014), soybean oil and protected fat (Silva *et al.*, 2018), glycerin (Lage *et al.*, 2016), whole soybeans (Rossi *et al.*, 2017), monensin (Hales *et al.*, 2012, 2013, 2014 2015, unpublished; Berndt *et al.*, unpublished), diethylstilbestrol (Rumsey *et al.*, 1981) and growth hormone-releasing factor (Lapierre *et al.*, 1992). After removal of data associated with the aforementioned treatments, 1413 individual records were retained.

Records with missing CH₄ or DMI values were removed from the database; records from respiration chambers in which two animals were housed simultaneously were combined by averaging the CH₄ and DMI and all other variables regarding the two animals; records from repeated measurements within the same experimental period were averaged over the individual measurements recorded. In total, 1366 individual animal records were subsequently retained. In addition, records from growing cattle with negative ADG, and a study for which DMI varied from 9.0 to 32.5 kg d⁻¹ (Rooke *et al.*, 2015, unpublished) were discarded from the dataset, leaving 1257 records retained. Finally, studies were screened on the basis of mean CH₄ yield after which two studies, for which the control treatments contained 60 and 82% forage had unrealistically low CH₄ yields of 10.3 and 11.3 g (kg DMI)⁻¹ (San Vito *et al.*, 2016; De Carvalho

et al., 2016), respectively, were considered outliers and removed from the dataset. This resulted in the retention of 1248 records.

2.2 Model development

Production, yield and intensity of CH₄ were predicted by fitting mixed-effects models according to:

$$y_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{ij1} + \beta_2 x_{ij2} + \dots + \beta_k x_{ijk} + s_i + \epsilon_{ij},$$

where y_{ij} denotes the j^{th} response variable of CH₄ production (g d⁻¹ animal⁻¹), CH₄ yield [g (kg DMI)⁻¹] or CH₄ intensity [g (kg ADG)⁻¹] from the i^{th} study; β_0 denotes the fixed effect of intercept; x_{ij1} to x_{ijk} denote the fixed effects of predictor variables and β_1 to β_k are the corresponding slopes; s_i and ϵ_{ij} denote the random effect of study and residual error, respectively, distributed as $s_i \sim N(0, \sigma_s^2)$, $\epsilon_{ij} \sim N(0, y_{ij}\sigma_e^2)$ for CH₄ production, and $\epsilon_{ij} \sim N(0, \sigma_e^2)$ for CH₄ yield and intensity; σ_s^2 is the between-study variance, σ_e^2 is the residual variance, and $y_{ij}\sigma_e^2$ is the residual error variance being proportional to the dependent variable.

In order to provide equations that depend on various predictor variables, eight categories of CH₄ production models were developed, of which four used a fixed and another four a selected combination of covariates: DMI only (DMI_C), DMI and dietary NDF content (DMI+NDF_C), DMI and dietary starch content (DMI+STA_C), DMI and dietary EE content (DMI+EE_C); a selection of DMI and the dietary NDF, starch, forage, EE, crude protein and ash contents (Diet_C), the Diet_C covariates plus BW (Animal_C), the Animal_C covariates except DMI (Animal_no_DMI_C), and DMI, the dietary NDF and crude protein contents, and BW (Global_C). Global_C was exclusively associated with covariates that had few or no missing data points. In addition to these eight categories, CH₄ production was predicted using Y_m only. The mixed-effects model to estimate Y_m of this GLOBAL NETWORK Tier 2 equation only

included y_{ij} , β_0 , s_i , and ϵ_{ij} of the previously shown model, with $\epsilon_{ij} \sim N(0, \sigma_e^2)$. According to the CH₄ production models, six categories of CH₄ yield prediction models were developed: dietary NDF content only (NDF_C), dietary starch content only (STA_C), dietary EE content only (EE_C); a selection of the dietary NDF, starch, forage, EE, crude protein and ash contents (Diet_no_DMI_C), the Animal_no_DMI_C covariates, and dietary NDF, forage and crude protein contents and BW (Global_no_DMI_C). Finally, eight categories of CH₄ intensity prediction models were developed: DMI_C, DMI+NDF_C, DMI+STA_C, DMI+EE_C, Diet_C, Animal_C, Animal_no_DMI_C and Global_C.

Covariates that play a key role in predicting CH₄ production were selected for Diet_C, Diet_no_DMI_C, Animal_C, Animal_no_DMI_C, Global_C and Global_no_DMI_C using a multistep selection approach. Model selection started with all potential covariates associated with the particular model category. Subsequently, one or more next selection steps were performed if not all records without missing values for the selected covariates were used in the previous step. A backward selection approach was applied throughout the different steps, *i.e.*, only covariates selected in a previous step could be selected for the next step. The model selection procedure stopped when the selected covariates were the same as the ones selected in the previous step. With this procedure, a model equation was constructed based on records that contained no missing values for the final selection of covariates and data sufficiency was maximized for the development of model equations throughout the different categories.

The Bayesian information criterion (BIC; *e.g.*, James *et al.*, 2014) was computed for all fitted models. The BIC is a well-known quantitative approach to model selection that favors more parsimonious models over more complex models by penalizing the number of parameters included in the model. Models with the smallest BIC were selected, as a smaller BIC indicates a

better tradeoff between the goodness of fit and the number of model parameters. In addition, the presence of multicollinearity of fitted models was examined based on the variance inflation factor. The largest variance inflation factor among all predictor variables was considered as an indicator of multicollinearity (Kutner *et al.*, 2005). The identified predictor variables were removed from the model one at a time using a stringent variance inflation factor cutoff value of 3 (Zuur *et al.*, 2010). All models were fitted using the *lme* function (Pinheiro and Bates, 2000) of R language and environment for statistical computing (R Core Team 2017; version 3.5.2).

2.3 Data handling

The entire database contained a wide variety of dietary forage contents ($57.6 \pm 29.8\%$ DM; average \pm SD), ranging from 8 to 100% DM. The database was split into a higher-forage subset containing the records with $\geq 25\%$ forage, and a lower-forage subset containing all data with $\leq 18\%$ forage. No studies tested forage contents between 18 and 25%. Because of the small coefficient of variation, dietary starch could not be selected for the lower-forage Diet_C, Animal_C, and Animal_no_DMI_C equations. To explore the geographical impact of CH₄ production, all European, North American and Brazilian higher-forage data were also used as separate subsets. Because of the scarcity of data from Australia and South Korea, no specific equations for the latter two regions were developed. Data from growing and finishing cattle for which ADG was measured were selected for a growing cattle subset, which enabled the development of CH₄ intensity [g (kg ADG)^{-1}] equations. Other outliers were identified using the interquartile range method (Zwillinger and Kokoska, 2000) based on all dependent and independent variables as in Niu *et al.* (2018). A factor of 1.5 for extremes was used in constructing boundaries to identify outliers for dependent variables and a factor of 2.5 for independent variables. Outliers were identified only for the complete database. The CH₄ intensity

[g (kg ADG)⁻¹] values were log transformed to stabilize normality before outlier identification. After removal of records with interquartile range identified outliers in the CH₄ production and variables, 1021 records from 114 dietary treatments and 39 studies were retained. Of these records 882 were from 104 treatments and 38 studies in the higher-forage subset, 139 from 10 treatments and 8 studies from the UK, Ireland, France, Canada and Brazil in the low-forage subset, 307 from 28 treatments and 15 studies in the European higher-forage subset, 394 from 36 treatments and 10 studies the North American higher-forage subset, 104 from 17 treatments and 7 studies the Brazilian higher-forage subset, 72 from 22 treatments and 5 studies from Australia, and 5 from 1 treatment and 1 study from South Korea.

The cleaned dataset used for analysis comprised measurements of enteric CH₄ emission that were obtained from respiration chambers ($n = 676$), the GreenFeed system ($n = 87$), and the sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆) tracer technique ($n = 258$). Animals were either kept in confinement or on pasture ($n = 991$ vs. 30, respectively). Types of forage frequently used in higher-forage diets included fresh alfalfa, sugarcane, sugarcane bagasse, corn silage, barley straw, whole-crop barley silage, whole-crop wheat silage, grass herbage, elephant grass, grass silage, grass seed hay, grass hay wrapping, timothy and natural grassland hay. Types of forage frequently used in lower-forage diets were barley straw, wheat straw, whole-crop wheat silage, corn silage and whole-crop barley silage. Concentrate ingredients in higher-forage and lower-forage diets included dried distillers grains, barley, canola meal, soybean meal, soybean hulls, crude glycerin, corn grain, cereal by-products, dehydrated alfalfa, dehydrated beet pulp, citrus pulp, wheat distillers grains, whole grain oats and minerals.

2.4 Cross-validation and model evaluation

The predictive accuracy of the developed CH₄ prediction models was evaluated using a leave-one-out cross-validation (*e.g.*, James *et al.*, 2014), in which all individual studies were consecutively taken as the testing set for model evaluation, while all remaining studies were taken as the training set for model fitting. Currently, most national enteric CH₄ inventories are based on energy conversion factors recommended by the IPCC (2006), which were evaluated, *i.e.*, not cross-validated. The IPCC models and the developed models throughout all categories were, if applicable, evaluated on the various (sub)sets using a combination of model evaluation metrics. Furthermore, equations from Yan *et al.* (2000, 2009) based on data from Northern Ireland, Ellis *et al.* (2007) based on data from North America, Ellis *et al.* (2009) based on data from Canada, Patra (2017) based on data from Brazil, India, Australia and Zimbabwe, Escobar-Bahamondes *et al.* (2017a) based on data from North America, Europe, Australia, Japan and New Zealand, Charmley *et al.* (2016) based on data from Australia, and the Mitscherlich equation from Mills *et al.* (2003) based on data from the UK were evaluated given that the covariates used in these published equations were available in the present database. Of these previously published extant equations, the equation that performed the best using our data and the single regression equation that only depended on DMI and performed the best using our data were reported in the present study. Data from studies included in the present database used for the development of these extant equations were excluded from evaluations of those extant equations to ensure independent evaluation.

First, the mean square prediction error (MSPE) was calculated according to Bibby and Toutenburg (1977) as:

$$\text{MSPE} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (O_i - P_i)^2}{n},$$

where O_i and P_i denote the observed and predicted value of the response variable for the i^{th} observation, respectively, and n denotes the number of observations. The square root of the mean square prediction error (RMSPE) was used to assess overall model prediction error. In the present study, RMSPE was expressed as a proportion of observed CH₄ production, yield or intensity means. The MSPE was decomposed into mean bias (MB), slope bias (SB) and random bias to identify systematic biases, of which the MB and SB were calculated as follows:

$$\text{MB} = (\bar{O} - \bar{P})^2,$$

$$\text{SB} = (s_p - r s_o)^2,$$

where \bar{O} and \bar{P} denote the predicted and observed means, s_p denotes the standard deviation of predicted values, s_o denotes the standard deviation of observed values, and r denotes the Pearson correlation coefficient. Second, the ratio of RMSPE and s_o , namely RMSPE-observations standard deviation ratio (RSR), which accounts for the specific variability of the data used for evaluation (Moriasi *et al.*, 2007), was used to compare the performance of models based on data from different (sub)sets. Smaller values of RSR indicate less variation in the prediction error compared to the standard deviation of the observations, with $\text{RSR} = 1$ indicating the RMSPE variance is equal to observed data variance. If $\text{RSR} > 1$, \bar{O} is a better predictor than P_i . Third, the concordance correlation coefficient (CCC; Lin, 1989), which quantifies both accuracy and precision based on the bias correction factor (C_b) and r by comparing the best-fit line and observations to the identity line ($y = x$), respectively, was calculated. The CCC is given as:

$$\text{CCC} = r \cdot C_b,$$

The closer the CCC of a model to 1, the better the model performance.

Different forage proportion cutoff values with increments of 5% from 15 to 50% were tested to evaluate the effect of the cutoff for splitting the database into higher-forage and lower-

forage subsets on equation performance. Cutoff values of 0, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40, 45, and 50% forage DM were used for evaluation. Per cutoff value, an RSR weighted to the number of observations for the DMI_C equation was calculated for the higher-forage and lower-forage CH₄ production equations, after which the optimal cutoff value could be determined.

3. Results

The inclusion criterion for dietary treatment had different effects on the variables means, viz., DMI (8.13 vs. 8.06 kg d⁻¹; cleaned vs. uncleaned averages, respectively), and NDF (35.0 vs. 35.0% of DM), starch (34.0 vs. 30.5% of DM), EE (3.02 vs. 3.52% of DM), ash (6.29 vs. 7.26% of DM), and forage (51.0 vs. 58.1% of DM) content of the diet, BW (478 vs. 487 kg), CH₄ production (161 vs. 164 g d⁻¹ animal⁻¹), CH₄ yield [20.0 vs. 20.4 g (kg DMI)⁻¹], CH₄ intensity [145 vs. 207 g (kg ADG)⁻¹] and Y_m (6.0 vs. 6.0 % of the gross energy intake). Summary statistics for the (sub)sets of the present cleaned database that included intake, dietary nutrient composition, BW, ADG and CH₄ variables are presented in Tables 1 and S1.

3.1 Methane production equations

The DMI_C all-data CH₄ production (g d⁻¹ animal⁻¹) equation indicated a positive relationship of DMI with CH₄ production (Eq. 1; Table 2; regression coefficient $\pm 2 \cdot \text{SE}$ gives a rough estimate of the 95% confidence interval boundaries that correspond to a *P*-value of 0.05, all *P*-values < 0.05 were not reported). The DMI+NDF_C, DMI+STA_C and DMI+EE_C equations had positive, negative and negative regression coefficients for dietary NDF, starch and EE in relation to CH₄ production, respectively (Eqns. 2-4). The RSR, which is the most appropriate statistic for evaluating equations based on different numbers of observations, for the DMI_C, DMI+NDF_C, DMI+STA_C and DMI+EE_C equations indicated similar predictive

performance, whereas the CCC indicated the DMI+NDF_C equation performed better than the DMI_C and DMI+EE_C equations (0.63 vs. 0.60 and 0.61, respectively). Dietary forage content and DMI were selected for the Diet_C and Animal_C equations (Eqns. 5-6), with BW also selected for the Animal_C equation. Dietary forage and ash and BW were selected for the Animal_no_DMI_C equation (Eq. 7). The Animal_C was the best performing all-data equation developed in the present analysis, with RSR and CCC of 0.61 and 0.76, respectively. Across the developed all-data equations, slope bias ranged from 1.01-12.7%, which was consistently associated with under-prediction at the high end and over-prediction at the low end of production (Fig. 1). Overall, models with a higher number of covariates tended to have less slope bias and had less between-study variance (σ_s^2 not shown).

The RSR of the all-data DMI_C CH₄ production equation was 0.71 (Table 3). Splitting the database into higher-forage and lower-forage subsets at cutoffs of 15 to 50% resulted in very similar weighted average RSR values of 0.68 to 0.69. The cutoff of 20% that was applied resulted in an RSR of 0.94 for the lower-forage subset at this cutoff value, whereas the cutoff values from 25 to 50% had all lower RSR values for the lower-forage subset. This might suggest that the lower-forage subset is a better predictor at a higher cutoff. However, the prediction of the data associated with $\leq 20\%$ forage did not improve at cutoff values $> 20\%$ (results not shown), indicating that data with $> 20\%$ forage decreased the RSR of the lower-forage subset, but not the data associated with $\leq 20\%$ forage. Based on these differences in performance and the fact that diets containing $\leq 20\%$ forage are commonly fed to cattle in intense feedlot production systems, the data were split at 20% forage throughout the present study, which made all lower-forage data contain $\leq 18\%$ forage and the higher-forage $\geq 25\%$ forage.

The higher-forage CH₄ production equations overlapped with the all-data equations, where DMI and dietary NDF, starch and EE in the DMI_C, DMI+NDF_C, DMI+STA_C and DMI+EE_C equations showed regression coefficients with the same sign (Eqns. 12-15; Table 4). Moreover, similar covariates were selected for the Diet_C, Animal_C and Animal_no_DMI_C equations as for the all-data equations, although the Animal_no_DMI_C equation did not contain dietary ash (Eqns. 16-18). The higher-forage equations predicted the higher-forage subset better than the all-data equations, with mean RSR of 0.62 vs. 0.66 and CCC of 0.70 vs. 0.68, respectively, for the DMI_C, DMI+NDF_C, DMI+STA_C, DMI+EE_C, Diet_C, Animal_C and Animal_no_DMI_C equations. The developed higher-forage equations under-predicted CH₄ production at the high end and over-predicted it at the low end of production, with the multiple regression equations having less slope bias than the DMI_C equation (Fig. 2). In line with the all-data equations, models with a higher number of covariates had less between-study variance.

In accordance with the all-data and the higher-forage equations, DMI was positively related to CH₄ production in the lower-forage DMI_C equation (Eq. 20; Table 5). The DMI+NDF_C, DMI+STA_C and DMI+EE_C equations indicated no significant relationships between the corresponding dietary NDF, starch and EE contents with CH₄ production (Eqns. 21-23; *P*-values of 0.14, 0.10 and 0.57, respectively). The lower-forage DMI_C equation predicted the lower-forage subset better than the all-data equations based on RSR, whereas the highest CCC of 0.35 for the lower-forage subset were obtained from the all-data DMI+STA_C and Animal_C equations (Eqns. 3, 6; Table 2). Systematic bias, that is the sum of mean and slope bias, was less than 5.75% for these developed lower-forage equations (Table 5), except for the DMI+STA_C equation that had 3.70 and 20.18% mean and slope bias, respectively. The minor

slope bias of the lower-forage DMI_C equation ($\leq 0.03\%$) was due to under-prediction of CH₄ production at the high end and over-prediction at the low end (Fig. 3).

In contrast to the higher-forage equations, dietary NDF and starch contents in the European higher-forage DMI+NDF_C and DMI+STA_C equations were not related to CH₄ production (Eqns. 29-30, Table 6; *P*-values of 0.20 and 0.69, respectively). Furthermore, DMI, dietary NDF and EE were selected for the Diet_C equation (Eq. 32) with BW also being selected for the Animal_C equation (Eq. 33), whereas DMI and BW, and BW were selected for the Global_C and Animal_no_DMI_C equations, respectively (Eqns. 34-35). The North American higher-forage equations were largely in line with the higher-forage equations. However, the Animal_no_DMI_C equation also contained dietary ash (Eq. 44; Table 7) as obtained for the all-data equation, and the Global_C equation also contained dietary crude protein (Eq. 45). The European higher-forage and North American higher-forage equations under-predicted CH₄ at the high end and over-predicted it at the low end of production, except for the European higher-forage DMI+EE_C equation, which under-predicted CH₄ at the low end and over-predicted at the high end (Figs. 4-5). Dietary NDF and EE contents in the Brazilian higher-forage DMI+NDF_C and DMI+EE_C equations were not significantly related to CH₄ production (Eqns. 49-50, Table S2; *P*-values of 0.28 and 0.05, respectively), the Diet_C equation contained DMI and dietary ash (Eq. 51), whereas the Animal_no_DMI_C equation contained dietary forage (Eq. 52). Slope bias varied from 9.05 to 18.9% for the developed Brazilian higher-forage equations, except for the Animal_no_DMI_C equation for which 32.9% slope bias was obtained. Equations under-predicted CH₄ production at the low end and over-predicted at the high end, whereas the Animal_no_DMI_C equation showed a negative observed vs. predicted correlation (Fig. S1). Compared to the higher-forage equations, the European higher-forage, North American higher-

forage and Brazilian higher-forage data were more adequately predicted by the European higher-forage (mean RSR of 0.80 vs. 0.85, mean CCC of 0.50 vs. 0.48; respectively; Tables 4, 6), North American higher-forage (mean RSR of 0.53 vs. 0.57, mean CCC of 0.80 vs. 0.77; respectively; Tables 4, 7) and Brazilian higher-forage (mean RSR of 1.13 vs. 1.35, respectively; Tables 4, S2), although mean CCC indicated Brazilian higher-forage data was more adequately predicted using the higher-forage than the Brazilian higher-forage equations (0.17 vs. 0.11, respectively; Tables 4, S2).

The IPCC (2006) Tier 2 higher-forage equation had an RSR of 0.68 and a CCC of 0.75 when evaluated using all data (Eq. 9; Table 2). Predicting the higher-forage subset with this equation resulted in RSR and CCC of 0.53 and 0.84, respectively (Eq. 9; Table 4). Despite this high accuracy of prediction of the Tier 2 approach, increased variance appeared along the unity line of the predicted vs. observed plots (Figs. 1-2). The IPCC Tier 2 (2006) lower-forage equation had an RSR of 1.38, a CCC of 0.17 and 59.6% mean bias for the lower-forage subset (Eq. 25; Table 5). The GLOBAL NETWORK Tier 2 equations with Y_m of 6.1% and 6.3% (Eqns. 8, 19; Tables 2, 4) performed slightly better than the IPCC Tier 2 (2006) equation for the all-data and higher-forage (sub)sets, respectively [note that the IPCC equations were validated, the GLOBAL NETWORK equations were cross-validated], whereas the lower-forage GLOBAL NETWORK Tier 2 equation with Y_m of 4.5% resulted in RSR of 0.90, a CCC of 0.43 and 0.47% of mean bias (Eq. 24) performed obviously better than the lower-forage IPCC Tier 2 equation. Although the IPCC currently uses a 10% forage cutoff, a Y_m of 4.5% is still more accurate than a Y_m of 3.0% for the present data, with RSR being 0.98 and 1.51, and CCC being 0.40 and 0.16 for the GLOBAL NETWORK and IPCC Tier 2 lower-forage equations, respectively (Eqns. 24-25). The European higher-forage and North American higher-forage subsets were associated with

414 RSR of 0.66 and 0.48, and CCC of 0.71 and 0.88 for the IPCC Tier 2 (2006) equation,
415 respectively (Eq. 9; Tables 6-7), whereas RSR of 1.81 and CCC of 0.21 were obtained for the
416 Brazilian higher-forage subset (Eq. 9; Table S2). Compared to the latter equation, the GLOBAL
417 NETWORK Tier 2 equations with Y_m of 6.6 and 6.3% performed similarly based on RSR and
418 CCC for the European higher-forage and North American higher-forage subset (Eqns. 36, 46;
419 Tables 6-7), whereas less mean bias was obtained with 1.89 vs. 3.54% and 2.51 vs. 8.70%,
420 respectively. The Brazilian higher-forage subset was better predicted when using the GLOBAL
421 NETWORK Tier 2 approach resulted in a Y_m of 5.5%, an RSR of 1.29, and a CCC of 0.28 (Eq.
422 53; Table S2).

423 Equations developed by Ellis *et al.* (2009), Charmley *et al.* (2016) and Escobar-
424 Bahamondes *et al.* (2017a) were among the best performing extant equations and outperformed
425 the Yan *et al.* (2000, 2009), Mills *et al.* (2003), Ellis *et al.* (2007) and Patra (2017) equations for
426 all (sub)sets. The best performing equation of Charmley *et al.* (2016) performed better than the
427 all-data DMI_C equation (Eqns. 1, 10; Table 2). The all-forage equation of Escobar-Bahamondes
428 *et al.* (2017a) appeared to perform most accurately among all of the equations (Eq. 11).
429 However, only 646 data points were available for independent evaluation. Based on RSR, it did
430 not outperform the Animal_C equation for these 646 data points. For the higher-forage subset,
431 the best Charmley *et al.* (2016) and the Escobar-Bahamondes *et al.* (2017a) equations performed
432 the best based on CCC (Eqns. 20, 11; Table 4), but not on RSR. The Ellis *et al.* (2009) equation
433 that also depended on the NDF:starch ratio (Eq. 26; Table 5) performed the best for the lower-
434 forage data with RSR of 0.89 and CCC of 0.41. For the European higher-forage subset, the best
435 Charmley *et al.* (2016) and the Escobar-Bahamondes *et al.* (2017a) equations (Eqns. 37, 11;
436 Table 6) did not perform better than the Animal_C equation when just considering RSR and

CCC values, although the Animal_C equation was evaluated using fewer data points. For the North American higher-forage subset, the best performing Charmley *et al.* (2016) equation (Eq. 47; Table 7) performed similarly to the Global_C equation based on RSR, whereas the Charmley *et al.* (2016) equation performed even slightly better based on CCC. Despite the accuracy of the various equations of Charmley *et al.* (2016) and in contrast to the Animal_C equations, the predicted *vs.* observed plots showed increasing variation along the unity line for all-data in particular (Fig. 1). However, the best-performing equations that were developed, which was the Animal_C equation for most subsets, did not show increasing variation along the unity line. This indicates that the best performing equations that were developed explain variation that is not captured by the Charmley *et al.* (2016) equations. These higher precisions obtained from the best performing equations is also indicated by the correlation coefficients of predicted *vs.* observed values on which the CCC is calculated (result not shown).

3.2 Methane yield equations

Positive, negative and negative slope regression coefficients were obtained for the NDF_C, STA_C and EE_C all-data CH₄ yield [g (kg DMI)⁻¹] equations (Eqns. 54-56, Table S3), respectively, which aligned with the all-data CH₄ production equations. The Diet_no_DMI_C and Global_no_DMI_C equations selected dietary forage (Eqns. 57-58), whereas dietary EE and ash were also selected for the Diet_no_DMI_C equation, and dietary crude protein for the Global_no_DMI_C equation. The NDF_C, STA_C, EE_C, Diet_no_DMI_C and Global_no_DMI_C equations had RSR values of 0.98, 1.06, 1.01, 0.97 and 0.96, respectively. The NDF_C, STA_C and EE_C higher-forage CH₄ yield equations indicated positive, negative and negative relationships to CH₄ yield, respectively (Eqns. 59-61, Table S4), whereas only dietary forage content was selected for the Diet_no_DMI_C equation (Eq. 62). The higher-forage

CH₄ yield was associated with RSR of 1.03 to 1.21 (Table S3) when predicted by the all-data equations, whereas the higher-forage equations predicted CH₄ yield of this subset with RSR values from 0.98 to 1.04 (Table S4). The higher-forage equations reproduced the observed variation in CH₄ yield less adequately than the all-data equations, with even a negative observed vs. predicted relationship for the higher-forage STA_C and EE_C equations (Figs. S2-S3).

3.3 Methane intensity equations

In contrast to the CH₄ production equations, the DMI regression coefficients in the all-data DMI_C and DMI+EE_C CH₄ intensity equations [g (kg ADG)⁻¹] contained zero in their confidence intervals (*P*-values of 0.14 and 0.22, respectively), whereas the DMI+NDF_C and DMI+STA_C equations had a positive regression coefficient for DMI (Eqns. 63-66; Table S5). In line with the CH₄ production equations, dietary NDF, starch and EE contents in the DMI+NDF_C, DMI+STA_C and DMI+EE_C equations had positive, negative and negative relationships with CH₄ intensity, respectively. Dietary forage content was selected for the Diet_C, Animal_no_DMI_C and Global_C equations (Eqns. 67-69), with DMI also being selected for the Diet_C equation and BW also being selected for the Global_C equation. The Diet_C, Animal_no_DMI_C and Global_C equations had RSR values of 0.99, 1.00 and 0.96, respectively, and appeared to predict the variation in CH₄ intensity most adequately (Fig. S4), whereas the other all-data CH₄ intensity equations had RSR greater than 1 and appeared to predict the variation in CH₄ intensity less adequately.

The higher-forage DMI_C, DMI+STA_C and DMI+EE_C equations did not indicate that DMI was related to CH₄ intensity (Eqns. 70, 72-73, Table S6; *P*-values of 0.06, 0.52 and 0.93, respectively). Dietary NDF was positively related to CH₄ intensity (Eq. 71), whereas dietary starch and EE contents were not related to CH₄ intensity (Eqns. 72-73; *P* = 0.32). Dietary ash

content was selected for the Diet_C equation (Eq. 74), whereas BW were selected for the Animal_C and Global_C equations (Eqns. 75-76), with dietary NDF also being selected for the Global_C equation. All higher-forage CH₄ intensity equations had RSR \geq 1.03. Furthermore, as also obtained for the higher-forage CH₄ yield equations, the higher-forage CH₄ intensity equations did not reproduce the observed variation in CH₄ intensity of the higher-forage subset more adequately than the all-data CH₄ intensity equations (Figs. S4-S5), which was also indicated by the RSR and CCC values.

4. Discussion

Global applicability is an important attribute of prediction equations of beef cattle enteric CH₄ emission. Various beef cattle systems that are applied world-wide may fit in our analysis. For more details about these beef cattle fattening systems, we refer to *e.g.*, De Vries *et al.* (2015), Gerssen-Gondelach *et al.* (2017) and Drouillard (2018). Our database, in which data (1021 individual records) from a variety of geographical regions across the world is represented, therefore, contributes to the overall robustness and global applicability of our all-data and higher-forage equations in particular. Hence, CH₄ production of beef cattle will be accurately predicted for data samples that represent a wider set of conditions throughout the world, which is a unique feature of the present equations. Several CH₄ prediction equations for beef cattle have been published previously, but they were developed from relatively small databases and only for one specific geographic region, such as Yan *et al.* (2009) using 108 individual animal records from 5 studies from Northern Ireland, Ellis *et al.* (2007) using 83 treatment means from 14 studies from North America, Ellis *et al.* (2009) using 872 individual animal records from 12 studies from

Alberta (Canada), and Moraes *et al.* (2014) using individual records from 414 heifers and 458 steers housed at one research station in the United States.

In the present study, we collated a wide-ranging database that included a large number of studies from Europe, North America, Brazil, Australia and South Korea, which represented diverse global beef production systems. Studies from tropical areas were, however, not predominant in the present analysis, for which we refer to Charmley *et al.* (2016) who included studies from tropical Australia, and Patra (2017) who included studies from India, Zimbabwe, Australia and Brazil. Furthermore, Escobar-Bahamondes *et al.* (2017a) had a database comprising 148 treatment means from 38 studies with diets containing > 40% forage, and a database comprising 43 treatment means from 17 studies with diets containing < 20% forage. Therefore, their analysis for lower-forage diets, in particular, included more data from more studies than ours, but their cutoff values for lower and higher forage were based on differences in microbiome composition rather than the prediction error used in the present analysis. Furthermore, their analysis did not explore intercontinental variation in beef cattle CH₄ emissions and did not have the benefit of using individual animal records. Other unique strengths of the present study are the development of CH₄ yield and intensity equations, whereas beef cattle studies are commonly limited to only total CH₄ production, and the inclusion of dietary forage content as a covariate of the three CH₄ emission metrics.

Our database includes data obtained with different CH₄ (*viz.*, respiration chambers, GreenFeed system, SF₆) and DMI (*viz.*, weighing and estimating using marker techniques) measurement methods. The different CH₄ measurement techniques have their strengths and weaknesses (Hammond *et al.*, 2016; Hristov *et al.*, 2018), whereas directly weighing the amount of feed offered and refusals and their dry matter content is regarded as more accurate than the

ytterbium and *n*-alkane markers used for some studies in the present database, which may over- or underestimate DMI (Pérez-Ramírez *et al.*, 2012). However, the development of a DMI_C CH₄ production equation specific for respiration chamber, GreenFeed system and SF₆ subsets did not consistently improve the RSR and CCC of the corresponding subsets compared with the all-data DMI_C equation (results not shown). Furthermore, including CH₄ measurement method as a covariate in the statistical model of an all-data DMI_C equation did not improve the model fit. Similar results were obtained for measurement method of DMI. Therefore, CH₄ and DMI measurement methods did not have a major effect on the performance of the equations developed in the present analysis. However, the relatively high and low accuracies with which the region-specific subsets could be predicted may be related to the CH₄ measurement methods, because the percentage of use of respiration chambers in the European higher-forage, North American higher-forage and Brazilian higher-forage subsets differed substantially (48, 95 and 0%, respectively). Finally, statistically accounting for cattle breed or cattle type (*e.g.*, steers, heifers, cows) was considered, but did not or not consistently improve the prediction of CH₄ production throughout the subsets.

Non-linear CH₄ prediction equations such as the Mitscherlich equation were previously found to outperform linear equations in some studies (*e.g.*, Mills *et al.*, 2003; Patra, 2017). However, for the present database, fitting non-linear equations, *viz.*, Monomolecular, Exponential, Mitscherlich and Power forms, did not result in improved prediction of CH₄ production compared to the linear DMI_C equations (result not shown). The latter result is in line with the non-linear Mills *et al.* (2003) and Patra (2017) equations that did not outperform the linear Charmley *et al.* (2016) equations. This suggests that a multiple linear regression approach, as used for the development of our Animal_C and Global_C equations rather than non-linear

approaches, improves the precision and accuracy of prediction of CH₄ production. The utility of ADG and digestibility of EE, NDF, nitrogen, gross energy, DM and organic matter for predicting CH₄ was also evaluated, but these covariates did not result in better prediction of CH₄ production than achieved by the various equations that are presented.

The linear regression equations of Charmley *et al.* (2016) that depended on DMI and outperformed our DMI_C equations were fitted using models that included more terms than just DMI, which resulted in nearly unbiased predictions of CH₄. Furthermore, the data Charmley *et al.* (2016) used were only from certain regions in Australia and may have been relatively homogeneous. The equations developed using these data may then result in accurate prediction of CH₄ production based on only DMI. Therefore, the prediction bias for our various Animal_C and Global_C equations and some potential overestimation of between-study variance that remained may vanish by the inclusion of even more covariates in the statistical model. The negligible bias obtained for the European higher-forage Animal_C equation, for which dietary crude protein and EE contents were available for all individual animal records used for fitting this model, and suggests that multiple regression equations are associated with less bias. Despite prediction biases of mixed-effects models being associated with the inclusion of the random study effect (see also White *et al.*, 2017), which applies to models with fewer covariates in particular, omission of the random study effect will affect the inference made on the covariates and may result in type II errors (St-Pierre, 2001). Therefore, for achieving unbiased predictions, mixed-effects models are ideally applied to datasets without missing values throughout the different covariates. Such datasets will result in greater variation of the dependent variable explained by multiple fixed-effects terms and less overestimation of the random study effect.

4.1 Key predictor variables

Dry matter intake was the most important predictor of enteric CH₄ production as it was significantly and positively related to CH₄ production for all-data and the higher-forage, lower-forage, European higher-forage and North American higher-forage subsets. A positive relationship between DMI and CH₄ production is in agreement with previous dairy and beef cattle studies (*e.g.*, Ellis *et al.*, 2007; Hristov *et al.*, 2013a; Richmond *et al.*, 2015; Bell *et al.*, 2016; Charmley *et al.*, 2016; Niu *et al.*, 2018) and this is because more CH₄ is produced when more substrate is available for microbial fermentation and in turn methanogenesis. In addition, all Diet_C and Animal_C models based on these five (sub)sets selected DMI for the prediction of CH₄ production, and the Animal_no_DMI_C equations did not perform as well as the Animal_C equations, indicating the importance of DMI relative to other covariates.

The positive relationship between the all-data CH₄ production and dietary NDF content also aligns with previous results (*e.g.*, Ellis *et al.*, 2007; Yan *et al.*, 2009; Niu *et al.*, 2018). The coefficients of variation were 43.8, 45.4 and 30.3% for CH₄ production, and 32.0, 30.6 and 8.6% for dietary NDF content for the all-data and the higher-forage and lower-forage subsets, respectively. This decrease in variation is in line with the disappearance of this positive relationship for the all-data and higher-forage *vs.* the lower-forage equations. Therefore, developing subsets with limited variation in forage percentage seems to have masked the positive relationship between CH₄ production and dietary NDF content. Furthermore, dietary nutrient contents change at the expense of other nutrients. Dietary NDF content may increase at the expense of more rapidly fermentable carbohydrates, which is positively associated with CH₄ production (Hatew *et al.*, 2015). The latter hypothesis aligns with a model with DMI and dietary NDF and starch fitted to all data having regression coefficients that were positive, positive and not different from zero for DMI and dietary NDF and starch, respectively (result not shown).

However, the lignin fraction of NDF being undegradable indicates that increased dietary NDF may not result in more CH₄ production in case of high lignin contents. Warner *et al.* (2016) observed lower CH₄ production but higher CH₄ yield per unit of digestible organic matter for dairy cattle fed grass silage of high lignin and NDF content, compared with grass silage of low lignin and NDF content. The observation of Na *et al.* (2017) who found different CH₄ yields per unit of DMI for deer and goats, but not per unit of digestible DMI may also support this hypothesis.

Dietary starch content is negatively related to CH₄ production as it typically increases propionate production in the rumen, yielding less H₂ for the reduction of CO₂ to CH₄ (Martin *et al.*, 2010; Grainger and Beauchemin, 2011). The effect of dietary starch on CH₄ production appeared to be less pronounced for higher-forage diets in dairy cows (Van Gastelen *et al.*, 2015), which may explain why no relationship between dietary starch content and CH₄ production was found for the European higher-forage subset, which had the highest forage content of all subsets. Furthermore, it was suggested that a critical dietary content of starch is required to decrease CH₄ production (Martin *et al.*, 2010; Van Gastelen *et al.*, 2015), possibly more than approximately 20% of DM, and that slight differences in intakes of starch, and other major carbohydrates (*e.g.*, hemicellulose, cellulose and lignin) cannot explain the difference in CH₄ emissions of cattle (Moe and Tyrrell, 1979; Moate *et al.*, 2018). This may also explain why no relationship between dietary starch content and CH₄ production was obtained based on the European higher-forage subset. The lack of a relationship between CH₄ production and dietary starch content for the lower-forage subset may be related to the small variation in starch content (coefficient of variation is 13.1%).

The positive relationship that was obtained between CH₄ production and dietary forage aligns with previously published studies (*e.g.*, Yan *et al.*, 2000; Hristov *et al.*, 2013) stating that either increased forage or decreased concentrate proportion in the diet yielded more CH₄. Johnson and Johnson (1995) referred to cattle fed more than 90% concentrate producing only half of the CH₄ produced by cattle fed more common concentrate proportions, and Aguerre *et al.*, 2011 observed a linear increase in CH₄ yield upon increasing dietary forage content from 47 to 68%. Nevertheless, a modeling study by Sauvant and Giger-Reverdin (2009) predicted that a decrease in CH₄ yield is only observed for dietary forage contents less than 65%. Despite the latter prediction, the frequent appearance of dietary forage in the equations developed in the present study indicates dietary forage content is a decent predictor of CH₄ emission, possibly more robust than dietary NDF content that was less frequently selected for the developed equations.

Dietary lipid content is commonly negatively related to CH₄ production (Grainger and Beauchemin, 2011). Lipids may inhibit cellulolytic bacteria, protozoal and archaeal activity, decrease NDF digestibility, and supply non-fermentable energy to the rumen, outcomes that can decrease CH₄ production (Maia *et al.*, 2007; Beauchemin *et al.*, 2008; Guyader *et al.*, 2014). Long-chain saturated fatty acids may have a minimal inhibitive effect on archaeal activity and CH₄ production, whereas fatty acids such as C12:0 and C18:3 were found to be relatively potent reducers (Machmüller and Kreuzer, 1999; Patra, 2013). Therefore, the actual decrease in CH₄ production obtained from lipids may depend on their fatty acid composition, although this is not confirmed by all *in vivo* studies (*e.g.*, Grainger and Beauchemin, 2011). More importantly, the removal of data associated with dietary lipid and oil supplements excluded data with higher dietary EE contents, which more potently decrease CH₄ production (Patra, 2013), may explain

why DMI+EE_C equations did not perform better than the DMI_C equations, despite the significant relationships that were obtained for CH₄ production and yield with dietary EE content.

Dietary crude protein content being positively associated with the all-data CH₄ yield in the present analysis aligns with the observation that dietary nitrogen content is positively related to fiber digestibility (Dijkstra *et al.*, 1996). However, decreased CH₄ production may only be observed from cattle fed a diet that is deficient in rumen degradable protein (Sutter *et al.*, 2017). In the present study, we did not observe any relationship between crude protein content and NDF digestibility, $r = 0.04$. However, we did observe a correlation between crude protein content and organic matter and dry matter digestibility, $r = 0.42$ and $r = 0.37$, respectively. This is possibly due to higher starch degradability, which could not be verified because of the lack of starch degradability data. Van Lingen *et al.* (2018) applying a multivariate regression approach found that the methodological issues such as the structure of random-effects (co)variance matrices and the combination of fixed-effects variables affect the statistical inference regarding the relationship between dietary crude protein and CH₄ production or yield. Therefore, also based on dietary crude protein selected for only one equation, the latter relationship may not be commonly strong as well as it may not generally exist. Dietary crude protein may actually be associated with lesser CH₄ production when sufficient rumen degradable protein is fed so as not to limit fermentation in the rumen due to N shortage (Dijkstra *et al.*, 2011), and may be considered a less robust predictor of CH₄ production than dietary NDF and starch.

A positive relationship between BW and CH₄ production observed in various equations in the present analysis aligns with previous cattle research (Yan *et al.*, 2009; Moraes *et al.*, 2014; Escobar-Bahamondes *et al.*, 2017a). Demment and Van Soest (1985) and Smith and Baldwin

(1974) observed rumen volume and weight proportional to BW of animals. Consequently, smaller animals ingest less feed and emit less CH₄ (Hristov *et al.*, 2013b). In addition, empirical modeling (Sauvant and Nozière, 2016) and mechanistic model simulations (Huhtanen *et al.*, 2015, 2016) indicated the DMI/BW ratio to be an important factor for CH₄ yield. At similar DMI, smaller cattle tend to produce less CH₄ as the passage rate from the rumen to the intestine may be higher due to a greater DMI/BW ratio. This has been confirmed in sheep for which animals yielding less CH₄ had smaller rumen size (Goopy *et al.*, 2014). Therefore, BW influences DMI, and DMI and rumen volume determine the passage rate of ruminal digesta, which affects feed digestibility, rumen fermentation conditions, and ultimately CH₄ production and yield.

4.2 Best performing equations

Various equations and model categories for predicting beef cattle CH₄ emission have been applied on various subsets in the present study. The Y_m models have only one parameter and are the simplest models, the DMI_C models are still fairly simple, whereas the Animal_C models are potentially the most complex. The Animal_C model commonly performed best among all models and outperformed the GLOBAL NETWORK Tier 2 equations, except for the European higher-forage subset. The DMI appeared to be the major predictor of enteric CH₄ production in beef cattle, but may not always be available for individual animals on commercial farms, which points to the value of the Animal_no_DMI_C models. Using dietary forage content and BW as a covariate commonly improved the prediction of CH₄ compared with a DMI_C equation. Therefore, the on-farm availability of all previously mentioned variables is recommended. This availability also enables the evaluation of the effect of dietary nutrient composition on CH₄ production. Moreover, the DMI+STA_C equation (Eq. 3) appeared to

perform well, and might also be used for the prediction of beef cattle CH₄ production, although this equation was based on fewer observations. Nevertheless, dietary starch content was never selected for the Diet_C, Animal_C, Animal_no_DMI_C and Global_C equations, whereas NDF content was, indicating that DMI+STA_C equations may be slightly less robust than Diet_C and Animal_C equations.

If dietary forage content is known to be > 25%, we recommend the use of the higher-forage equations, because the RSR and CCC of these equations are lower and higher, respectively, compared to the higher-forage subset evaluation of the all-data equations. Based on their predictive performance, the higher-forage Animal_C and the Escobar-Bahamondes *et al.* (2017a) equations (Eqns. 17, 11; Table 4) are specifically recommended. Despite its lower precision, the Charmley *et al.* (2016) equation (Eq. 20) will still give an accurate estimate of CH₄ production if only DMI is available. If dietary forage percentage is ≤ 18%, we recommend the Ellis *et al.* (2009) equations (Eqns. 26-27; Table 5). In addition, we recommend the lower-forage DMI_C or all-data DMI+NDF_C, DMI+STA_C and Animal_C equations that performed relatively well (Eqns. 20, 2-3, 6; Tables 2, 5). If dietary forage content is between 18 and 25%, we suggest an all-data equation that includes dietary forage, or dietary NDF or starch, because of the forage content that is commonly related to the latter two carbohydrate fractions. The European higher-forage and North American higher-forage equations performed somewhat better on RSR and CCC than the higher-forage equations for the European higher-forage and North American higher-forage subsets, and less systematic bias was obtained for the region-specific equations. Therefore, we most strongly recommend the Diet_C, Animal_C and Charmley *et al.* (2016) equations (Eq. 32-33, 37; Table 6). For North American higher-forage

data, the Global_C and Charmley *et al.* (2016) equations are recommended in particular (Eqns. 45, 47; Table 7).

Models that assumed a fixed Y_m , such as the IPCC and GLOBAL NETWORK Tier 2 equations, performed nearly as good as the developed more complex best performing equations in most cases. The Tier 2 equations may, therefore, have a high potential for predicting beef cattle CH₄ production as well, in particular for higher-forage diets, although the higher variance along the unity lines of the predicted *vs.* observed plots indicates a lack of precision. Moreover, the substantial mean bias that was obtained for the lower-forage subset in particular emphasizes the importance of an accurate estimate of Y_m . In cases where dietary forage contents are not close to the means of the present data (sub)sets, we do not recommend the use of the Y_m equations considered in the present study, but an equation that contains dietary forage, NDF or starch. A Y_m of 4.5% that was obtained for lower-forage diets may be fairly accurate given a Y_m of 5.2% that was reported for 42 treatments means with $\leq 17\%$ forage (Escobar-Bahamondes *et al.*, 2017b), and a Y_m of 3.8% for 34 treatments means with $\leq 18\%$ forage (Escobar-Bahamondes *et al.*, 2017a). Both of these studies reported 9.5% forage on average for studies collected from multiple continents. These Y_m values are all higher than the 3.0%, which the IPCC uses for $\leq 10\%$ forage diets. The $\leq 10\%$ forage records in the present analysis, which also had a Y_m of 4.5% suggests that the Y_m value for lower-forage diets used by the IPCC needs to be reconsidered. However, practices such as feeding steam-flaked corn (Hales *et al.*, 2012) and dietary supplementation with monensin (Appuhamy *et al.*, 2013) may require alternative prediction as these diets may have a Y_m value of 3.0%. This also applies to fat supplemented diets (Grainger and Beauchemin, 2011; Patra, 2013).

For CH₄ yield predictions, the all-data NDF_C, Diet_no_DMI_C and Global_no_DMI_C CH₄ yield equations (Eqns. 54, 57-58) had RSR values < 1 and are suitable for use if dietary forage content is unknown. The Global_no_DMI_C equations may also be used if dietary forage content is known to be ≤ 18%. The higher-forage Diet_no_DMI_C CH₄ yield equation is the only equation to consider for forage contents > 25% (Eq. 62; Table S4), based on RSR values > 1 for the other higher-forage CH₄ yield equations. For forage contents between 18 and 25% we recommend an all-data equation with RSR < 1 and the highest CCC value when evaluated with all data, which is the Global_no_DMI_C yield equation (Eq. 58). Given that all CH₄ intensity equations were associated with an RSR value > 1 for the higher- and lower-forage subsets, we recommend the observed average values of 108 and 161 [g (kg ADG)⁻¹] for dietary forage contents of ≤ 18% and ≥ 25%, respectively. For dietary contents between 18 and 25% or if forage content is unknown we recommend the all-data Global_C equation (Eq. 69; Table S5).

5. Conclusion

Our analysis is based on the large GLOBAL NETWORK dataset comprising data from several continents and a wide variety of forage contents. As observed previously, DMI is the key factor for predicting beef cattle enteric CH₄ production. Non-linear models with DMI as the only independent variable did not outperform their counterpart linear models. However, linear models depending on DMI and dietary forage content or these two covariates plus BW commonly had an improved predictive ability. Separate equations for lower-forage (≤ 18%) and higher-forage (≥ 25%) data also improved predictive ability. Model evaluation specific to European higher-forage, North American higher-forage and Brazilian higher-forage diets compared with that of intercontinental higher-forage diet models suggests that overall enteric CH₄ production is more

755 accurately predicted by region-specific models, although in many cases the best intercontinental
756 and region-specific models may perform similarly. The equations developed in the present study
757 commonly had higher precision and less prediction error with similar accuracy compared to the
758 extant equations that were evaluated. Evaluation of CH₄ emission conversion factors indicated
759 that region-specific and in particular dietary forage content-based Y_m values are required for
760 adequately predicting beef cattle CH₄ production in national or global inventories.

Acknowledgments

Authors gratefully acknowledge project funding from the USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture Federal Appropriations under Project PEN 04539 and Accession number 1000803; the Joint Programming Initiative on Agriculture, Food Security and Climate Change (FACCE-JPI)'s 'GLOBAL NETWORK' project and the 'Feeding and Nutrition Network' (<http://animalscience.psu.edu/fnn>) of the Livestock Research Group within the Global Research Alliance for Agricultural Greenhouse Gases (www.globalresearchalliance.org); the Sesnon Endowed Chair program (UC Davis); the Swiss Federal Office of Agriculture, Berne, Switzerland; AHDB Beef and Lamb, the Scottish Government, Defra and the devolved administrations through the UK Agricultural Greenhouse Gas Inventory Research Platform; French National Research Agency through the FACCE-JPI program (ANR-13-JFAC-0003-01); the Cooperative Research Program for Agriculture Science, (Project No. PJ013448012018), RDA, Republic of Korea; the Australian Government Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry (Carbon Farming Futures Action on the Ground program; AOTGR2-0400); the financial support of the Reducing Emissions from Livestock Research Program, the National Livestock Methane Program, Meat and Livestock Australia, CSIRO and Ridley AgriProducts Pty, Ltd; the Institute of Science and Technology in Animal Science (INCTCA 465377/2014-9), the Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine (DAFM), Ireland (AGRI-I project); European Commission through SMethane (FP7-SME-262270); Beef Cattle Research Council of the Canadian Cattlemen's Association; the Cofund for Monitoring & Mitigation of Greenhouse Gases from Agri- and Silvi-culture (FACCE ERA-GAS)'s project Capturing Effects of Diet on Emissions from Ruminant Systems and the Dutch Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality (AF-EU-18010 & BO-4400159-01).

References

- Aguerre, M.J., Wattiaux, M.A., Powell, J.M., Broderick, G.A., Arndt, C., 2011. Effect of forage-to-concentrate ratio in dairy cow diets on emission of methane, carbon dioxide, and ammonia, lactation performance, and manure excretion. *J. Dairy Sci.* 94, 3081-3093. <https://doi:10.3168/jds.2010-4011>
- Appuhamy, J.A.D.R.N., Strathe, A.B., Jayasundara, S., Wagner-Riddle, C., France, J., Dijkstra, J., Kebreab E., 2013. Anti-methanogenic effects of monensin in dairy and beef cattle: A meta-analysis. *J. Dairy Sci.* 96, 5161-5173. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2012-5923>
- Bannink, A., Schijndel, M.W. van, Dijkstra, J., 2011. A model of enteric fermentation in dairy cows to estimate methane emission for the Dutch National Inventory Report using the IPCC Tier 3 approach. *Anim. Feed Sci. Technol.* 166-167, 603-618. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2011.04.043>
- Basarab, J.A., Okine, E.K., Baron, V.S., Marx, T., Ramsey, P., Ziegler, K., Lyle, K., 2005. Methane emissions from enteric fermentation in Alberta's beef cattle population. *Can. J. Anim. Sci.* 85, 501-512. <https://doi.org/10.4141/A04-069>
- Beauchemin, K.A., Kreuzer, M., O'Mara, F.O., McAllister, T.A., 2008. Nutritional management for enteric methane abatement: a review. *Austr. J. Exp. Agric.* 48, 21-27. <https://doi.org/10.1071/EA07199>
- Bell, M., Eckard, R., Moate, P.J., Yan, T., 2016. Modelling the effect of diet composition on enteric methane emissions across sheep, beef cattle and dairy cows. *Animals*, 6, 54. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani6090054>

805 Benchaar, C., Hassanat, F., Martineau, R., Gervais, R., 2015. Linseed oil supplementation to
806 dairy cows fed diets based on red clover silage or corn silage: Effects on methane
807 production, rumen fermentation, nutrient digestibility, N balance, and milk production. J.
808 Dairy Sci. 98, 7993-8008. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2015-9398>

809 Bibby, J., Toutenburg, T., 1977. Prediction and Improved Estimation in Linear Models. John 785
810 Wiley Sons, Chichester.

811 Castelan-Ortega, O.A., Ku-Vera, J.C., Estrada-Flores, J.G., 2014. Modeling methane emissions
812 and methane inventories for cattle production systems in Mexico. Atmosfera 27, 185-191.
813 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0187-6236\(14\)71109-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0187-6236(14)71109-9)

814 Charmley, E., Williams, S.R.O., Moate, P.J., Hegarty, R.S., Herd, R.M., Oddy, V.H., Reyenga,
815 P., Staunton, K.M., Anderson, A., Hannah, M.C. 2016. A universal equation to predict
816 methane production of forage-fed cattle in Australia. Anim. Prod. Sci. 56, 169-180.
817 <https://doi.org/10.1071/AN15365>

818 Demment, M.W., Van Soest, P.J., 1985. A nutritional explanation for body-size patterns of
819 ruminant and non-ruminant herbivores. American Naturalist 125, 641-672.
820 <https://doi.org/10.1086/284369>

821 Dijkstra, J., France, J., Assis, A.G., Neal, H.D.St.C., Campos, O.F., Aroeira, L.J.M., 1996.
822 Simulation of digestion in cattle fed sugarcane: prediction of nutrient supply for milk
823 production with locally available supplements. J. Agric. Sci. 127, 247-260.
824 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021859600078023>

825 Dijkstra, J., Oenema, O., Bannink, A., 2011. Dietary strategies to reducing N excretion from
826 cattle: Implications for methane emissions. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.* 3, 414-422.
827 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2011.07.008>

828 Drouillard, J.S., 2018. Current situation and future trends for beef production in the United States
829 of America - A review. *Asian-Australas. J. Anim. Sci.* 31, 1007-1016.
830 <https://doi.org/10.5713/ajas.18.0428>

831 Ellis, J.L., Kebreab, E., Odongo, N.E., McBride, B.W., Okine, E.K., France, J., 2007. Prediction
832 of methane production from dairy and beef cattle. *J. Dairy Sci.* 90, 3456-3467.
833 <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2006-675>

834 Ellis, J.L., Kebreab, E., Odongo, N.E., Beauchemin, K.A., McGinn, S., Nkrumah, J.D., Moore,
835 S.S., Christopherson, R., Murdoch, G.K., McBride, B.W., Okine, E.K., France, J., 2009.
836 Modeling methane production from beef cattle using linear and nonlinear approaches. *J.*
837 *Anim. Sci.* 87, 1334-1345. <https://doi.org/10.2527/jas.2007-0725>

838 Escobar-Bahamondes, P., Oba, M., Beauchemin, K.A., 2017a. Universally applicable methane
839 prediction equations for beef cattle fed high- or low-forage diets. *Can. J. Anim. Sci.* 97,
840 83-94. <https://doi.org/10.1139/cjas-2016-0042>

841 Escobar-Bahamondes, P., Oba, M., Beauchemin, K.A., 2017b. An evaluation of the accuracy and
842 precision of methane prediction equations for beef cattle fed high-forage and high-grain
843 diets. *Animal* 11, 68-77. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S175173111600121X>

844 Gastelen, S. van, Antunes-Fernandes, S.C., Hettinga, K.A., Klop, G., Alferink, S.J.J., Hendriks,
845 W.H., Dijkstra, J., 2015. Enteric methane production, rumen volatile fatty acid
846 concentrations, and milk fatty acid composition in lactating Holstein-Friesian cows fed

847 grass silage- or corn silage-based diets. J. Dairy Sci. 98, 1915-1927.
848 <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2014-8552>

849 Gerber, P.J., Steinfeld, H., Henderson, B., Mottet, A., Opio, C., Dijkman, J., Falcucci, A., Tempio, G,
850 2013. *Tackling climate change through livestock – A global assessment of emissions and*
851 *mitigation opportunities*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO),
852 Rome.

853 Gerssen-Gondelach, S.J., Lauwerijssen, R.B.G., Havlík, P., Herrero, M., Valin, H., Faaij, A.P.C.,
854 Wicke, B., 2017. Intensification pathways for beef and dairy cattle production systems:
855 Impacts on GHG emissions, land occupation and land use change. Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.
856 240, 135-147. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2017.02.012>

857 Goopy, J., Donaldson, A., Hegarty, R., Vercoe, P., Haynes, F., Barnett, M., Oddy, V., 2014.
858 Low-methane yield sheep have smaller rumens and shorter rumen retention time. Brit. J.
859 Nutr. 111, 578-585. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007114513002936>

860 Grainger, C., Beauchemin, K.A., 2011. Can enteric methane emissions from ruminants be
861 lowered without lowering their production? Anim. Feed Sci. Technol. 166-167, 308-320.
862 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2011.04.021>

863 Guyader, J., Eugène, M., Nozière, P., Morgavi, D., Doreau, M., Martin, C., 2014. Influence of
864 rumen protozoa on methane emission in ruminants: A meta-analysis approach. Animal 8,
865 1816-1825. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1751731114001852>

866 Hammond, K.J., Crompton, L.A., Bannink, A., Dijkstra, J., Yáñez-Ruiz, D.R., O’Kiely, P.,
867 Kebreab, E., Eugène, M.A., Yu, Z., Shingfield, K.J., Schwarm, A., Hristov, A.N.,
868 Reynolds, C.K., 2016. Review of current *in vivo* measurement techniques for quantifying

869 enteric methane emission from ruminants. Anim. Feed Sci. Technol. 219, 13-30.
870 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2016.05.018>

871 Hales, K.E., Cole, N.A., MacDonald, J.C., 2012. Effects of corn processing method and dietary
872 inclusion of wet distillers grains with solubles on energy metabolism, carbon-nitrogen
873 balance, and methane emissions of cattle. J. Anim. Sci. 90, 3174-3185.
874 <https://doi.org/10.2527/jas.2011-4441>

875 Hatew, B., Cone, J.W., Pellikaan, W.F., Podesta, S.C., Bannink, A., Hendriks, W.H., Dijkstra, J.,
876 2015. Relationship between in vitro and in vivo methane production measured
877 simultaneously with different dietary starch sources and starch levels in dairy cattle.
878 Anim. Feed Sci. Technol. 202, 20-31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2015.01.012>

879 Hristov, A.N., Oh, J., Firkins, J., Dijkstra, J., Kebreab, E., Waghorn, G., Makker, M.P.S.,
880 Adesogan, A.T., Yang, W., Lee, C., Gerber, P.J., Henderson, B., Tricarico, J.M., 2013a.
881 SPECIAL TOPICS - Mitigation of methane and nitrous oxide emissions from animal
882 operations: I. A review of enteric methane mitigation options. J. Anim. Sci. 91, 5045-
883 5069. <https://doi.org/10.2527/jas.2013-6583>

884 Hristov, A.N., Ott, J., Tricarico, J.M., Rotz, A., Waghorn, G., Adesogan, A.T., Dijkstra, J.,
885 Montes, F., Oh, J., Kebreab, E., Oosting, S.J., Gerber, P.J., Henderson, B., Makker,
886 H.P.S., Firkins, J., 2013b. SPECIAL TOPICS - Mitigation of methane and nitrous oxide
887 emissions from animal operations: III. A review of animal management mitigation
888 options. J. Anim. Sci. 91, 5095-5113. <https://doi.org/10.2527/jas.2013-6585>

889 Hristov, A.N., Kebreab, E., Niu, M., Oh, J., Bannink, A., Bayat, A.R., Boland, T., Brito, A.F.,
890 Casper, D., Crompton, L.A., Dijkstra, J., Eugène, M.A., Garnsworthy, Ph.C., Haque,

891 M.N., Hellwing, A.L.F., Huhtanen, P., Kreuzer, M., Kuhla, B., Lund, P., Madsen, J.,
892 Martin, C., Moate, P.J., Muetzel, S., Muñoz, C., Peiren, N., Powell, J.M., Reynolds, C.K.,
893 Schwarm, A., Shingfield, K.J., Storlien, T.M., Weisbjerg, M.R., Yáñez-Ruiz, D.R., Yu,
894 Z., 2018. *Symposium review: Uncertainties in enteric methane inventories, measurement*
895 *techniques, and prediction models.* J. Dairy Sci. 101, 6655-6674.
896 <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2017-13536>

897 Huhtanen, P., Ramin, M., Udén, P., 2015. Nordic dairy cow model Karoline in predicting
898 methane emissions: 1. Model description and sensitivity analysis. Livest. Sci. 178, 71-80.
899 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.livsci.2015.05.009>

900 Huhtanen, P., Ramin, M., Cabezas-Garcia, E.H., 2016. Effects of ruminal digesta retention time
901 on methane emissions: a modelling approach. Anim. Prod. Sci. 56, 501-506.
902 <https://doi.org/10.1071/AN15507>

903 IPCC (2006. *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories.*
904 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, IGES, Kanagawa, Japan.

905 IPCC (2014. *2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from*
906 *the Kyoto Protocol*, Hiraishi, T., Krug, T., Tanabe, K., Srivastava, N., Baasansuren, J.,
907 Fukuda, M., Troxler, T.G. (eds) IPCC, Switzerland.

908 James, G., Witten, D., Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R., 2014. *An introduction to statistical learning:*
909 *With applications in R.* Springer New York, US.

910 Johnson, K.A., Johnson, D.E., 1995. Methane emissions from cattle. J. Anim. Sci. 73, 2483-
911 2492. <https://doi.org/10.2527/1995.7382483x>

912 Kebreab, E., Johnson, J.A., Archibeque, S.L., Pape, D., Wirth, T., 2008. Model for estimating
 913 enteric methane emissions from United States dairy and feedlot cattle. *J. Anim. Sci.* 86,
 914 2738-2748. <https://doi.org/10.2527/jas.2008-0960>

915 Kutner, M.H., Nachtsheim, C., Neter, J., Li, W., 2005. *Applied linear statistical models*. Boston:
 916 McGraw-Hill Irwin. New York, US.

917 Lin, L.I., 1989. A concordance correlation coefficient to evaluate reproducibility. *Biometrics*, 45,
 918 255-268. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2532051>

919 Lingen, H.J. van, Fadel, J.G., Bannink, A., Dijkstra, J., Tricarico, J., Pacheco, D., Casper, D.P.,
 920 Kebreab, E., 2018. Multi-criteria evaluation of dairy cattle feed resources and animal
 921 characteristics for nutritive and environmental impacts. *Animal* 12, s310-s320.
 922 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1751731118001313>

923 Machmüller, A., Kreuzer, M., 1999. Methane suppression by coconut oil and associated effects
 924 on nutrient and energy balance in sheep. *Can. J. Anim. Sci.* 79, 65-72.
 925 <https://doi.org/10.4141/A98-079>

926 Maia, M.R.G., Chaudhary, L.C., Figueres, L., Wallace, R.J., 2007. Metabolism of
 927 polyunsaturated fatty acids and their toxicity to the microflora of the rumen. *Anton.*
 928 *Leeuw.* 91, 303-314. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10482-006-9118-2>

929 Martin, C., Morgavi, D.P., Doreau, M., 2010. Methane mitigation in ruminants: from microbe to
 930 the farm scale. *Animal* 4, 351-365. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1751731109990620>

931 Mills, J.A.N., Kebreab, E., Yates, C.M., Crompton, L.A., Cammell, S.B., Dhanoa, M.S., Agnew,
 932 R.E., France, J., 2003. Alternative approaches to predicting methane emission from dairy
 933 cows. *J. Anim. Sci.* 81, 3141-3150. <https://doi.org/10.2527/2003.81123141x>

934 Moate, P.J., Williams, S.R.O., Deighton, M.H., Hannah, M.C., Ribaux, B.E., Morris, G.L.,
 935 Jacobs, J.L., Hill, J., Wales, W.J., 2019. Effects of feeding wheat or corn and of rumen
 936 fistulation on milk production and methane emissions of dairy cows. *Anim. Prod. Sci.* 59,
 937 891-905. <https://doi.org/10.1071/AN17433>

938 Moe, P.W., Tyrrell, H.F., 1979. Methane production in dairy cows. *J. Dairy Sci.* 62, 1583-1586.
 939 [https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302\(79\)83465-7](https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(79)83465-7)

940 Moraes, L.E., Strathe, A.B., Fadel, J.G., Casper, D.P., Kebreab, E., 2014. Prediction of enteric
 941 methane emissions from cattle. *Glob. Change Biol.* 20, 2140-2148.
 942 <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.12471>

943 Moriasi, D.N., Arnold, J.G., Van Liew, M.W., Bingner, R.L., Harmel, R.D., Veith, T.L., 2007.
 944 Model evaluation guidelines for systematic quantification of accuracy in watershed
 945 simulations. *T. ASABE* 50, 885-900. <https://doi.org/10.13031/2013.23153>

946 Na, Y., Li, D.H., Lee, S.R., 2017. Effects of dietary forage-to-concentrate ratio on nutrient
 947 digestibility and enteric methane production in growing goats (*Capra hircus hircus*) and
 948 Sika deer (*Cervus nippon hortulorum*). *Asian-Australas. J. Anim. Sci.* 7, 967-972.
 949 <https://doi.org/10.5713/ajas.16.0954>

950 Niu, M., Kebreab, E., Hristov, A.N., Oh, J., Arndt, C., Bannink, A., Bayat, A.R., Brito, A.F.,
 951 Boland, T., Casper, D.P., Crompton, L.A., Dijkstra, J., Eugène, M.A., Garnsworthy,
 952 Ph.C., Haque, M.N., Hellwing, A.L.F., Huhtanen, P., Kreuzer, M., Kuhla, B., Lund, P.,
 953 Maden, J., Martin, C., McClelland, S.C., McGee, M., Moate, P.J., Muetzel, S., Muñoz,
 954 C., O’Kiely, P., Peiren, N., Reynolds, C.K., Schwarm, A., Shingfield, K.J., Storlien,
 955 T.M., Weisbjerg, M.R., Yáñez-Ruiz, D.R., Yu, Z., 2018. Prediction of enteric methane

956 production, yield and intensity in dairy cattle using an intercontinental database. Glob.
 957 Change Biol. 24, 3368-3389. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.14094>

958 Opio, C., Gerber, P., Mottet, A., Falcucci, A., Tempio, G., MacLeod, M., Vellinga, T.,
 959 Henderson, B., Steinfeld, H., 2013. Greenhouse gas emissions from ruminant supply
 960 chains – A global life cycle assessment. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United
 961 Nations (FAO), Rome.

962 Patra, A.K., 2013. The effect of dietary fats on methane emissions, and its other effects on
 963 digestibility, rumen fermentation and lactation performance in cattle: A meta-analysis.
 964 Livest. Prod. Sci. 155, 244-254. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.livsci.2013.05.023>

965 Patra, A.K., 2017. Prediction of enteric methane emission from cattle using linear and non-linear
 966 statistical models in tropical production systems. Mitig. Adapt. Strateg. Glob. Change 22,
 967 629-650. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11027-015-9691-7>

968 Pérez-Ramírez, E., Peyraud, J.L., Delagarde, R., 2012. *N*-alkanes v. ytterbium/faecal index as
 969 two methods for estimating herbage intake of dairy cows fed on diets differing in the
 970 herbage:maize silage ratio and feeding level. Animal 6, 232-244.
 971 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1751731111001480>

972 Pinheiro, J.C., Bates, D.M., 2000. *Mixed-effects models in S and S-PLUS*. Springer Verlag, New
 973 York, Inc.

974 Popp, A., Lotze-Campen, H., Bodirsky, B., 2010. Food consumption, diets shifts and associated
 975 non-CO₂ greenhouse gases from agricultural production. Glob. Environ. Change 20, 451-
 976 462. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2010.02.001>

977 R Core Team 2017. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for
 978 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>.
 979 Richmond, A.S., Wylie, A.R.G., Laidlaw, A.S., Lively, F.O., 2015. Methane emissions from
 980 beef cattle grazing on semi-natural upland and improved lowland grasslands. *Animal* 9,
 981 130-137. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1751731114002067>
 982 Santiago-Suarez, B., Moraes, L.E., Appuhamy, J.A.D.R.N., Pellikaan, W.F., Casper, D.P.,
 983 Tricarico, J., Kebreab, E., 2016. Prediction and evaluation of enteric methane emissions
 984 from lactating dairy cows using different levels of covariate information. *Anim. Prod. Sci.*
 985 56, 557-564. <https://doi.org/10.1071/AN15496>
 986 Sauvant, D., Giger-Reverdin, S., 2009. Modélisation des interactions digestives et de la production
 987 de méthane chez les ruminants. (In French.) *INRA Prod. Anim.* 22, 375-384.
 988 Sauvant, D., Nozière, P., 2016. Quantification of the main digestive processes in ruminants: the
 989 equations involved in the renewed energy and protein feed evaluation systems. *Animal* 10,
 990 755-770. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1751731115002670>
 991 St-Pierre N.R., 2001. Invited Review: Integrating quantitative findings from multiple studies using
 992 mixed model methodology. *J. Dairy Sci.*, 84, 741-755. [https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-](https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(01)74530-4)
 993 [0302\(01\)74530-4](https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(01)74530-4)
 994 Sutter, F., Schwarm, A., Kreuzer, M., 2017. Development of nitrogen and methane losses in the
 995 first eight weeks of lactation in Holstein cows subjected to deficiency of utilisable crude
 996 protein under restrictive feeding conditions. *Arch. Anim. Nutr.* 71, 1-20.
 997 <https://doi.org/10.1080/1745039X.2016.1258880>

998 Vries, M. de, Middelaar, C.E. van, Boer, I.J.M. de, 2015. Comparing environmental impacts of
 999 beef production systems: A review of life cycle assessments. *Livest. Sci.* 178, 279-288.
 1000 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.livsci.2015.06.020>

1001 Warner, D., Hatew, B., Podesta, S.C., Klop, G., van Gastelen, S., van Laar, H., Dijkstra, J.,
 1002 Bannink, A., 2016. Effects of nitrogen fertilisation rate and maturity of grass silage on
 1003 methane emission by lactating dairy cows. *Animal* 10, 34-43.
 1004 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1751731115001640>

1005 White, R.R., Roman-Garcia, Y., Firkins, J.L., VanDeHaar, M.J., Armentano, L.E., Weiss, W.P.,
 1006 McGill, T., Garnett, R., Hanigan, M.D., 2017. Evaluation of the National Research
 1007 Council (2001) dairy model and derivation of new prediction equations. 1. Digestibility
 1008 of fiber, fat, protein, and non-fiber carbohydrate. *J. Dairy Sci.* 100, 3591-3610.
 1009 <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2015-10800>

1010 Yan, T., Agnew, R.E., Gordon, F.J., Porter, M.G., 2000. Prediction of methane energy output in
 1011 dairy and beef cattle offered grass silage-based diets. *Livest. Prod. Sci.* 64, 253-263.
 1012 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0301-6226\(99\)00145-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0301-6226(99)00145-1)

1013 Yan, T., Porter, M.G., Mayne, C.S., 2009. Prediction of methane emission from beef cattle using
 1014 data measured in indirect open-circuit respiration calorimeters, *Animal* 3, 1455-1462.
 1015 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S175173110900473X>

1016 Zuur, A.F., Ieno, E.N., Elphick, C.S., 2010. A protocol for data exploration to avoid common
 1017 statistical problems. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* 1, 3-14. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2041-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2041-210X.2009.00001.x)
 1018 [210X.2009.00001.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2041-210X.2009.00001.x)

1019 Zwillinger, D., Kokoska, S., 2000. *CRC Standard Probability and Statistics Tables and*
1020 *Formulae*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, US.

1021 Table 1. Variable summary statistics for all data, higher-forage (data associated with a forage content $\geq 25\%$), lower-forage (data associated with a forage content
1022 $\leq 18\%$), European higher-forage (EUR-HF) and North American higher-forage (NrAm-HF) entries of the GLOBAL NETWORK beef cattle database.

Item*	All data (<i>n</i> = 1021)				Higher-forage (<i>n</i> = 882)				Lower-forage (<i>n</i> = 139)				EUR-HF (<i>n</i> = 307)				NrAm-HF (<i>n</i> = 394)			
	Mean	Min	Max	SD	Mean	Min	Max	SD	Mean	Min	Max	SD	Mean	Min	Max	SD	Mean	Min	Max	SD
DMI (kg d ⁻¹)	8.13	2.26	17.5	2.82	7.81	2.26	17.5	2.86	10.1	4.77	15.6	1.89	9.46	3.17	15.7	2.12	6.16	2.26	14.1	2.51
GEI (MJ d ⁻¹)	150	42.6	317	53.7	144	42.6	317	53.1	191	88.2	300	37.1	177	57.8	299	42.0	114	42.6	254	45.4
Diet composition (% of DM)																				
CP	14.6	6.19	22.5	2.56	14.6	6.19	21.3	2.60	14.6	11.4	22.5	2.35	14.3	7.80	19.2	1.84	15.6	10.0	21.3	2.52
EE	3.02	0.372	7.02	1.20	2.87	0.372	7.02	1.05	3.90	0.377	5.63	1.57	3.65	0.372	5.80	1.40	2.58	0.669	5.50	0.825
Ash	6.29	3.22	13.7	2.11	6.52	3.22	13.7	2.13	4.85	3.50	8.00	1.24	6.06	3.40	11.4	1.80	6.51	3.22	13.7	2.29
NDF	35.0	17.2	73.9	11.2	36.6	17.2	73.9	11.2	24.7	19.8	33.3	3.12	37.5	26.1	68.4	7.25	32.9	17.5	67.8	9.76
ADF	19.3	6.92	50.8	8.13	20.6	7.50	50.8	8.06	11.6	6.92	14.5	1.99	21.7	14.0	40.3	5.15	17.5	7.50	36.5	7.28
STA	34.0	2.50	64.1	13.6	32.2	2.50	64.1	14.3	42.0	32.0	56.9	4.52	25.3	2.50	40.3	10.3	41.2	16.8	64.1	12.6
For	51.0	8.0	100	27.7	57.7	25.0	100	24.0	9.8	8.0	18.1	3.18	64.6	31.0	100	16.9	47.9	25.0	100	23.6
ADG (kg d ⁻¹)	1.25	0.060	3.38	0.431	1.19	0.060	3.38	0.438	1.46	0.552	2.22	0.330	1.22	0.088	1.99	0.348	NA	NA	NA	NA
BW (kg)	478	133	791	148	454	133	791	144	625	376	734	76.5	571	133	791	128	391	196	699	116
Methane emissions																				
CH ₄ (g d ⁻¹)	161	37.0	372	70.5	162	37.0	372	73.5	153	45.1	310	46.4	215	40.9	372	71.8	125	37.0	313	57.5
CH ₄ /DMI (g kg ⁻¹)	20.0	6.29	35.1	5.05	20.7	6.29	35.1	4.75	15.2	7.50	30.9	4.29	22.5	6.64	35.1	5.19	20.3	6.29	33.3	4.21
CH ₄ /ADG (g kg ⁻¹)																				
¹) ♪	4.98	3.31	6.68	0.522	5.08	3.31	6.68	0.528	4.68	3.84	5.71	0.362	5.20	3.31	6.68	0.517	NA	NA	NA	NA
Y _m (% of GEI)§	6.0	1.9	10.4	1.5	6.3	1.9	10.4	1.4	4.5	2.3	8.7	1.2	6.7	2.0	10.3	1.5	6.2	1.9	10.4	1.3

1023 *DM = dry matter, DMI = dry matter intake, GEI = gross energy intake, CP = dietary crude protein, EE = dietary ether extract, NDF = dietary neutral detergent fiber,

1024 ADF = dietary acid detergent fiber, STA = dietary starch, For = dietary forage, ADG = average daily body weight gain, BW = body weight.

1025 ‡Min = minimum, Max = maximum, SD = standard deviation.

1026 ♪ ln transformed values.

1027 §Methane conversion factor (%): energy of CH₄ as a proportion of GEI; the specific energy of CH₄ is 55.65 MJ kg⁻¹.

1028 Table 2. All-data CH₄ emission (g d⁻¹ animal⁻¹) prediction equations for various categories and model performance across the data (sub)sets
1029 based on root mean square prediction error (RMSPE; % of mean), RMSPE-observations-standard-deviation-ratio (RSR), mean and slope bias (MB
1030 and SB; % of mean square prediction error), and concordance correlation coefficient (CCC).

Model development				Model performance						
Eq.	Category§	Prediction equation*	<i>n</i> †	(Sub)set‡	<i>p</i> ‡	RMSPE, %	RSR	MB, %	SB, %	CCC
[1]	DMI_C	54.2 (7.6) + 12.6 (0.6) × DMI	1021	All-data	991	31.2	0.71	0.69	12.55	0.60
				Higher-forage	852	30.8	0.67	3.86	27.26	0.64
				Lower-forage	139	33.9	1.12	34.96	0.59	0.27
[2]	DMI+NDF_C	−16.4 (9.0) + 12.1 (0.6) × DMI + 2.10 (0.16) × NDF	1021	All-data	991	31.4	0.71	0.92	1.99	0.63
				Higher-forage	852	31.8	0.69	1.82	2.81	0.65
				Lower-forage	139	28.7	0.94	3.45	2.10	0.32
[3]	DMI+STA_C	126 (11) + 11.5 (0.9) × DMI − 1.75 (0.16) × STA	704	All-data	704	28.9	0.71	6.09	1.01	0.65
				Higher-forage	575	28.7	0.70	13.87	1.80	0.68
				Lower-forage	129	30.1	0.96	15.77	0.64	0.35
[4]	DMI+EE_C	83.0 (9.8) + 11.9 (0.6) × DMI − 7.31 (1.69) × EE	754	All-data	754	29.4	0.71	1.35	8.83	0.61
				Higher-forage	644	29.2	0.67	0.08	19.59	0.64
				Lower-forage	110	30.3	1.21	37.59	4.20	0.25
[5]	Diet_C	−0.767 (7.493) + 12.0 (0.5) × DMI + 1.12 (0.06) × For	1021	All-data	991	29.5	0.67	2.39	1.24	0.70
				Higher-forage	852	29.5	0.64	1.30	2.12	0.72
				Lower-forage	139	29.8	0.98	17.57	0.30	0.32
[6]	Animal_C, Global_C	−28.3 (8.3) + 10.3 (0.6) × DMI + 1.12 (0.06) × For + 0.0885	1003	All-data	991	26.9	0.61	2.20	1.37	0.76
				All-data♯,‡	646	22.5	0.52	3.05	0.41	0.84

		$(0.0150) \times BW$		Higher-forage	852	26.8	0.58	2.00	1.83	0.78
				Lower-forage	139	27.8	0.91	3.72	0.65	0.35
[7]	Animal_no_DMI_C	$6.03 (10.40) + 1.25 (0.07) \times \text{For} - 2.29 (0.77) \times \text{Ash} + 0.212 (0.015) \times BW$	992	All-data	991	30.9	0.70	0.55	1.98	0.65
				Higher-forage	852	30.9	0.67	0.23	3.04	0.68
				Lower-forage	139	31.3	1.03	5.86	3.26	0.11
[8]	GLOBAL	$[0.061 (0.001) \times \text{GEI}] / 0.05565$	1021	All-data	991	28.5	0.64	0.59	0.27	0.75
	NETWORK Tier 2			All-data ^{♫,♬}	991	28.3	0.64	0.23	0.87	0.76
[9]	IPCC Tier 2 (2006) ¶	$(0.065 \times \text{GEI}) / 0.05565$	-	All-data [♫]	991	29.9	0.68	7.97	3.04	0.75
[10]	Charmley <i>et al.</i> (2016)	$-6.10 + 20.6 \times \text{DMI}$		All-data ^{♫,ℓ}	939	28.9	0.66	0.00	1.15	0.74
[11]	Escobar-Bahamondes <i>et al.</i> (2017a)	$-35.0 + 0.08 \times BW + 1.2 \times \text{For} - 69.8 \times \text{EEI}^3 + 3.14 \times \text{GEI}$		All-data ^{♫,‡}	646	23.2	0.54	11.66	2.12	0.85

1031 § Category acronyms (*e.g.*, DMI_C) are explained in the ‘Model development’ subsection of the ‘Methods and Materials’ section.

1032 * Equations are presented with regression coefficient standard errors in parenthesis; DMI = dry matter intake (kg d⁻¹), NDF = dietary neutral

1033 detergent fiber (% of DM), STA = dietary starch (% of DM), EE = dietary ether extract (% of DM), Ash = dietary ash (% of DM), For = dietary

1034 forage (% of DM), BW = body weight (kg), GEI = gross energy intake (MJ d⁻¹), EEI = ether extract intake (kg d⁻¹).

1035 †*n* = number of observations used to fit model equations

1036 ‡All-data = all data collected for analysis, Higher-forage = data associated with a forage content ≥ 25%, Lower-forage = data associated with a
1037 forage content ≤ 18%.

1038 †*p* = numbers of observations used for model evaluation.

1039 ¶IPCC = Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

1040 ♫Performance was evaluated, not cross-validated.

1041 ♬No independent evaluation.

1042 ¶The 991 data points minus data from Tomkins *et al.* (2011) and Kennedy and Charmley (2012) to ensure independent evaluation.

1043 #The 991 data points minus data from Pinares-Patiño *et al.* (2003), Chaves *et al.* (2006), McGeough *et al.* (2010ab), Doreau *et al.* (2011), Staerfl

1044 *et al.* (2012), Hünérberg *et al.* (2013ab) and Troy *et al.* (2015) to ensure independent evaluation.

1045 Table 3. Root mean square prediction error-standard-deviation-ratio (RSR) of the DMI_C CH₄ production (g d⁻¹) equations based on lower-forage
1046 (≤ forage content cutoff) and higher-forage (> forage content cutoff) subsets, their number of observations (*n*), and the average RSR weighted to
1047 the number of higher- and lower-forage observations (All) for various diet forage content cutoff values to split the entire dataset into lower-forage
1048 and higher-forage subsets.

(Sub)set	Forage content cutoff (% of DM)								
	0	15	20	25	30	35	40	45	50
Higher-forage	NA	0.65	0.64	0.65	0.68	0.68	0.69	0.70	0.62
<i>n</i>	NA	902	882	783	672	664	602	579	474
Lower-forage	NA	0.95	0.94	0.78	0.69	0.70	0.68	0.68	0.73
<i>n</i>	NA	119	139	238	349	357	419	442	547
All	0.71	0.68	0.68	0.68	0.69	0.69	0.69	0.69	0.68

1049

1050 Table 4. Higher-forage CH₄ emission (g d⁻¹ animal⁻¹) prediction equations for various categories and model performance across the data subsets
1051 based on root mean square prediction error (RMSPE; % of mean), RMSPE-observations-standard-deviation-ratio (RSR), mean and slope bias (MB
1052 and SB; % of mean square prediction error), and concordance correlation coefficient (CCC).

Model development					Model performance					
Eq.	Category§	Prediction equation*	<i>n</i> †	(Sub)set‡	<i>p</i> ‡	RMSPE, %	RSR	MB, %	SB, %	CCC
[12]	DMI_C	52.8 (7.5) + 13.8 (0.6) × DMI	882	Higher-forage	852	29.3	0.64	0.28	22.78	0.68
				EUR-HF	307	29.3	0.88	26.42	15.91	0.43
				NrAm-HF	394	27.3	0.59	16.37	27.26	0.75
				BRZ-HF	75	26.1	1.40	31.70	22.96	0.23
[13]	DMI+NDF_C	23.8 (9.1) + 13.5 (0.6) × DMI + 0.844 (0.165) × NDF	882	Higher-forage	852	29.1	0.64	0.20	17.83	0.69
				EUR-HF	307	29.0	0.87	27.08	14.11	0.45
				NrAm-HF	394	25.2	0.55	13.46	21.70	0.80
				BRZ-HF	75	24.9	1.34	24.24	26.05	0.25
[14]	DMI+STA_C	83.4 (11.4) + 13.6 (0.8) × DMI – 0.594 (0.161) × STA	575	Higher-forage	575	26.6	0.65	1.42	16.37	0.68
				EUR-HF	273	26.0	0.93	21.41	4.37	0.35
				NrAm-HF	269	24.7	0.56	16.08	20.02	0.78
				BRZ-HF	14	29.2	2.47	77.05	9.49	-0.04
[15]	DMI+EE_C	66.4 (9.5) + 13.3 (0.6) × DMI – 3.69 (1.56) × EE	644	Higher-forage	644	27.8	0.64	1.32	15.45	0.69
				EUR-HF	122	26.1	1.00	43.22	6.45	0.39
				NrAm-HF	394	28.4	0.61	18.29	28.79	0.73
				BRZ-HF	104	24.0	1.33	30.48	19.06	0.23
[16]	Diet_C	23.4 (8.1) + 13.2 (0.5) × DMI +	882	Higher-forage	852	27.9	0.61	0.49	15.52	0.72

		$0.571 (0.080) \times \text{For}$		EUR-HF	307	27.9	0.84	25.38	12.04	0.49
				NrAm-HF	394	23.1	0.50	8.40	17.91	0.83
				BRZ-HF	75	22.6	1.21	14.48	25.25	0.28
[17]	Animal_C, Global_C	$-6.41 (8.31) + 11.3 (0.6) \times \text{DMI} +$ $0.557 (0.077) \times \text{For} + 0.0996$ $(0.0142) \times \text{BW}$	864	Higher-forage	852	24.6	0.54	0.80	14.74	0.80
				Higher-forage [‡]	567	21.2	0.47	0.11	10.43	0.86
				EUR-HF	307	24.5	0.73	18.25	11.11	0.61
				NrAm-HF	394	20.3	0.44	3.82	11.92	0.88
				BRZ-HF	75	21.2	1.14	1.36	27.11	0.22
[18]	Animal_no_DMI_C	$17.9 (10.4) + 0.732 (0.091) \times \text{For} +$ $0.226 (0.015) \times \text{BW}$	864	Higher-forage	852	30.8	0.67	0.01	13.23	0.65
				EUR-HF	307	26.3	0.79	14.80	11.89	0.52
				NrAm-HF	394	33.1	0.72	18.90	5.82	0.65
				BRZ-HF	75	27.0	1.45	31.74	25.94	-0.14
[19]	GLOBAL	$[0.063 (0.002) \times \text{GEI}] / 0.05565$	882	Higher-forage	852	24.6	0.54	2.12	1.37	0.82
	NETWORK Tier 2			Higher-forage ^{‡,¶}	852	24.0	0.52	0.14	0.62	0.83
[9]	IPCC Tier 2 (2006) ¶	$(0.065 \times \text{GEI}) / 0.05565$	-	Higher-forage [‡]	852	24.1	0.53	1.19	0.06	0.84
[20]	Charmley <i>et al.</i> (2016)	$21.0 \times \text{DMI}$		Higher-forage ^{‡,}	829	25.4	0.57	0.10	0.05	0.81
[11]	Escobar-Bahamondes <i>et al.</i> (2017a)	$-35.0 + 0.08 \times \text{BW} + 1.2 \times \text{For} -$ $69.8 \times \text{EEI}^3 + 3.14 \times \text{GEI}$		Higher-forage ^{‡,‡}	567	23.1	0.51	9.61	1.56	0.86

1053 § Category acronyms (*e.g.*, DMI_C) are explained in the ‘Model development’ subsection of the ‘Methods and Materials’ section.

1054 * Equations are presented with regression coefficient standard errors in parenthesis; DMI = dry matter intake (kg d⁻¹), NDF = dietary neutral

1055 detergent fiber (% of DM), STA = dietary starch (% of DM), EE = dietary ether extract (% of DM), For = dietary forage (% of DM), BW = body

1056 weight (kg), GEI = gross energy intake (MJ d⁻¹), EEI = ether extract intake (kg d⁻¹).

1057 ‡n = number of observations used to fit model equations.

1058 ‡Higher-forage = data associated with a forage content $\geq 25\%$, EUR-HF = European data associated with a forage content $\geq 25\%$, NrAm-HF =
 1059 North American data associated with a forage content $\geq 25\%$, BRZ-HF = Brazilian data associated with a forage content $\geq 25\%$.
 1060 ‡ p = numbers of observations used for model evaluation.
 1061 ¶IPCC = Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.
 1062 ♪Performance was evaluated, not cross-validated.
 1063 ♪No independent evaluation.
 1064 ¶The 852 data points minus data from Tomkins *et al.* (2011) and Kennedy and Charmley (2012) to ensure independent evaluation.
 1065 #The 852 data points minus data from Pinares-Patiño *et al.* (2003), Chaves *et al.* (2006), McGeough *et al.* (2010ab), Doreau *et al.* (2011), Staerfl
 1066 *et al.* (2012), Hünerberg *et al.* (2013ab) and Troy *et al.* (2015) to ensure independent evaluation.

1067 Table 5. Lower-forage CH₄ emission (g d⁻¹ animal⁻¹) prediction equations and model performance using the lower-forage subset based on root
1068 mean square prediction error (RMSPE; % of mean), RMSPE-observations-standard-deviation-ratio (RSR), mean and slope bias (MB and SB; % of
1069 mean square prediction error), and concordance correlation coefficient (CCC).

Model development					Model performance					
Eq.	Category§	Prediction equation*	n^{\dagger}	(Sub)set‡	p^{\ddagger}	RMSPE, %	RSR	MB, %	SB, %	CCC
[20]	DMI_C, Diet_C, Animal_C, Global_C	$46.6 (19.4) + 9.54 (1.80) \times \text{DMI}$	139	Lower-forage	139	28.4	0.94	4.81	0.03	0.26
[21]	DMI+NDF_C	$112 (47) + 9.46 (1.79) \times \text{DMI} - 2.58 (1.72) \times \text{NDF}$	139	Lower-forage	139	29.3	0.96	4.74	1.34	0.25
[22]	DMI+STA_C	$42.0 (38.9) + 9.85 (1.88) \times \text{DMI} + 0.0331 (0.7546) \times \text{STA}$	129	Lower-forage	129	34.5	1.11	3.70	20.18	0.23
[23]	DMI+EE_C	$57.0 (18.1) + 8.84 (1.74) \times \text{DMI} - 1.17 (2.03) \times \text{EE}$	110	Lower-forage	110	24.1	0.96	4.54	1.22	0.26
[24]	GLOBAL NETWORK Tier 2	$[0.045 (0.002) \times \text{GEI}] / 0.05565$	139	Lower-forage	139	27.9	0.92	3.13	3.02	0.39
				Lower-forage♫,♫♫	139	27.3	0.90	0.47	3.99	0.43
				Lower-forage♫,ℓ	101	25.2	0.98	2.27	12.91	0.41
[25]	IPCC Tier 2 (2006) Lower-forage♫	$(0.030 \times \text{GEI}) / 0.05565$	-	Lower-forage♫	139	42.1	1.38	59.60	0.08	0.17
				Lower-forage♫,ℓ	101	39.0	1.51	64.08	0.35	0.16
[26]	Ellis <i>et al.</i> (2009); Eq. N	$48.2 + 14.1 \times \text{DMI} - 20.5 \times (\text{STA/NDF})$		Lower-forage♫	129	27.8	0.89	0.26	2.04	0.41
[27]	Ellis <i>et al.</i> (2009); Eq. A	$41.2 + 12.0 \times \text{DMI}$		Lower-forage♫	139	27.9	0.92	6.19	0.15	0.34

1070 §Category acronyms (*e.g.*, DMI_C) are explained in the ‘Model development’ subsection of the ‘Methods and Materials’ section; no
 1071 Animal_no_DMI_C equation available.

1072 *Equations are presented with regression coefficient standard errors in parenthesis; DMI = dry matter intake (kg d^{-1}), NDF = dietary neutral
 1073 detergent fiber (% of DM), STA = dietary starch (% of DM), EE = dietary ether extract (% of DM), GEI = gross energy intake (MJ d^{-1}).

1074 † n = number of observations used to fit model equations.

1075 ‡Lower-forage = data associated with a forage content $\leq 18\%$.

1076 ‡ p = numbers of observations used for model evaluation.

1077 ¶IPCC = Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

1078 ♪Performance was evaluated, not cross-validated.

1079 ♪No independent evaluation.

1080 ‖A subset containing $\leq 10\%$ forage records only was used (as recommended by the IPCC, 2006)

1081 Table 6. European higher-forage CH₄ emission (g d⁻¹ animal⁻¹) prediction equations for various categories and model performance based on root
1082 mean square prediction error (RMSPE; % of mean), RMSPE-observations-standard-deviation-ratio (RSR), mean and slope bias (MB and SB; % of
1083 mean square prediction error), and concordance correlation coefficient (CCC).

Model development				Model performance						
Eq.	Category§	Prediction equation*	<i>n</i> †	(Sub)set‡	<i>p</i> ‡	RMSPE, %	RSR	MB, %	SB, %	CCC
[28]	DMI_C	60.5 (16.4) + 15.0 (1.4) × DMI	307	EUR-HF	307	26.3	0.79	4.86	15.69	0.48
[29]	DMI+NDF_C	38.1 (23.3) + 14.9 (1.4) × DMI + 0.598 (0.470) × NDF	307	EUR-HF	307	25.9	0.77	5.21	13.15	0.51
[30]	DMI+STA_C	92.4 (21.7) + 11.7 (2.0) × DMI + 0.113 (0.285) × STA	273	EUR-HF	273	25.6	0.92	9.92	2.20	0.30
[31]	DMI+EE_C	133 (34) + 14.5 (2.0) × DMI – 18.4 (6.6) × EE	122	EUR-HF	122	23.7	0.91	1.86	13.87	0.54
[32]	Diet_C	–20.9 (43.6) + 14.3 (2.0) × DMI + 4.04 (1.06) × NDF – 15.4 (3.8) × EE	122	EUR-HF	122	18.4	0.70	5.57	0.97	0.70
[33]	Animal_C	–102 (40.5) + 11.6 (2.1) × DMI + 3.74 (0.79) × NDF – 11.1 (3.0) × EE + 0.164 (0.054) × BW	122	EUR-HF	122	16.7	0.64	3.49	0.00	0.75
				EUR_HF#	109	15.5	0.58	1.31	0.13	0.79
[34]	Animal_no_DMI_C	34.1 (18.7) + 0.287 (0.028) × BW	307	EUR-HF	307	27.0	0.81	10.37	3.73	0.50
[35]	Global_C	24.3 (17.7) + 9.37 (2.06) × DMI + 0.153 (0.040) × BW	307	EUR-HF	307	24.5	0.73	8.88	11.91	0.58
[36]	GLOBAL	[0.066 (0.003) × GEI] / 0.05565	307	EUR-HF	307	22.9	0.69	7.03	2.04	0.68
	NETWORK Tier 2			EUR-HF♫,♫	307	21.8	0.65	1.89	1.34	0.71

[9]	IPCC Tier 2, 2006¶	$(0.065 \times \text{GEI}) / 0.05565$	-	EUR-HF♫	307	22.0	0.66	3.54	1.61	0.71
[37]	Charmley <i>et al.</i> (2016)	$-15.3 + 24.7 \times \text{DMI}$		EUR-HF♫	307	21.9	0.66	0.61	0.16	0.72
					122	19.7	0.75	2.09	3.18	0.66
[11]	Escobar-Bahamondes <i>et al.</i> (2017a)	$-35.0 + 0.08 \times \text{BW} + 1.2 \times \text{For} - 69.8 \times \text{EEI}^3 + 3.14 \times \text{GEI}$		EUR-HF♫,‡	109	16.0	0.60	0.61	0.37	0.77

1084 §Category acronyms (*e.g.*, DMI_C) are explained in the ‘Model development’ subsection of the ‘Methods and Materials’ section.

1085 *Equations are presented with regression coefficient standard errors in parenthesis; DMI = dry matter intake (kg d⁻¹), NDF = dietary neutral
1086 detergent fiber (% of DM), STA = dietary starch (% of DM), EE = dietary ether extract (% of DM), BW = body weight (kg), GEI = gross energy
1087 intake (MJ d⁻¹), EEI = ether extract intake (kg d⁻¹).

1088 †*n* = number of observations used to fit model equations.

1089 ‡EUR-HF = European data associated with a forage content ≥ 25%.

1090 ‡*p* = numbers of observations used for model evaluation.

1091 ¶IPCC = Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

1092 ♫Performance was evaluated, not cross-validated.

1093 ♫No independent evaluation.

1094 # The 307 data points minus data from Pinares-Patiño *et al.* (2003), McGeough *et al.* (2010ab), Doreau *et al.* (2011), Staerfl *et al.* (2012) and Troy
1095 *et al.* (2015) to ensure independent evaluation.

Table 7. North American higher-forage CH₄ emission (g d⁻¹ animal⁻¹) prediction equations for various categories and model performance based on root mean square prediction error (RMSPE; % of mean), RMSPE-observations-standard-deviation-ratio (RSR), mean and slope bias (MB and SB; % of mean square prediction error), and concordance correlation coefficient (CCC).

Eq.	Category§	Model development			Model performance					
		Prediction equation*	<i>n</i> †	(Sub)set‡	<i>p</i> ‡	RMSPE, %	RSR	MB, %	SB, %	CCC
[38]	DMI_C	33.9 (7.7) + 14.7 (0.6) × DMI	394	NrAm-HF	394	25.3	0.55	0.00	26.45	0.78
[39]	DMI+NDF_C	1.58 (8.30) + 14.2 (0.6) × DMI + 1.05 (0.16) × NDF	394	NrAm-HF	394	23.8	0.52	0.02	16.29	0.82
[40]	DMI+STA_C	89.7 (10.7) + 14.2 (0.8) × DMI – 1.17 (0.17) × STA	269	NrAm-HF	269	21.4	0.49	1.90	9.73	0.84
[41]	DMI+EE_C	43.7 (8.8) + 14.7 (0.6) × DMI – 3.72 (1.52) × EE	394	NrAm-HF	394	25.0	0.54	0.01	25.47	0.78
[42]	Diet_C	7.41 (7.12) + 14.1 (0.6) × DMI + 0.632 (0.069) × For	394	NrAm-HF	394	22.2	0.48	0.01	11.10	0.85
[43]	Animal_C,	–15.1 (7.5) + 12.7 (0.6) × DMI + 0.644 (0.066) × For + 0.0779 (0.0134) × BW	394	NrAm-HF	394	20.1	0.43	0.02	6.12	0.88
[44]	Animal_no_DMI_C	14.0 (12.3) + 0.965 (0.104) × For + 0.207 (0.018) × BW – 3.02 (0.95) × Ash	394	NrAm-HF	394	32.2	0.70	0.32	5.45	0.63
[45]	Global_C	–38.8 (10.9) + 12.7 (0.6) × DMI + 0.605 (0.066) × For + 1.61 (0.56) × CP + 0.0779 (0.0133) × BW	394	NrAm-HF	394	20.0	0.43	0.04	3.03	0.89
[46]	GLOBAL NETWORK Tier 2	[0.063 (0.003) × GEI] / 0.05565	394	NrAm-HF	394	21.9	0.48	0.81	0.03	0.87
				NrAm-HF ^{♯, ♯♯}	394	21.4	0.46	2.51	0.02	0.88
[9]	IPCC Tier 2, 2006¶	(0.065 × GEI) / 0.05565	-	NrAm-HF [♯]	394	22.2	0.48	8.70	0.50	0.88
[47]	Charmley <i>et al.</i> (2016)	20.5 × DMI		NrAm-HF [♯]	394	20.0	0.43	0.45	0.02	0.90

§Category acronyms (*e.g.*, DMI_C) are explained in the ‘Model development’ subsection of the ‘Methods and Materials’ section.

- 1100 *Equations are presented with regression coefficient standard errors in parenthesis; DMI = dry matter intake (kg d^{-1}), NDF = dietary neutral
1101 detergent fiber (% of DM), STA = dietary starch (% of DM), EE = dietary ether extract (% of DM), For = dietary forage (% of DM), GEI = gross
1102 energy intake (MJ d^{-1}), BW = body weight (kg).
1103 † n = number of observations used to fit model equations.
1104 ‡NrAm-HF = North American data associated with a forage content $\geq 25\%$.
1105 ‡ p = numbers of observations used for model evaluation.
1106 ¶IPCC = Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.
1107 ♪Performance was evaluated, not cross-validated.
1108 ♪No independent evaluation.

Figure 1. Observed vs. predicted plots for all-data methane emission ($\text{g d}^{-1} \text{ animal}^{-1}$) prediction equations for the different categories, viz., dry matter intake (DMI_C), dry matter intake and neutral detergent fiber (DMI+NDF_C), dry matter intake and starch (DMI+STA_C), dry matter intake and ether extract (DMI+EE_C), diet (Diet_C), animal (Animal_C), animal without DMI (Animal_no_DMI_C), GLOBAL NETWORK Tier 2, IPCC Tier 2 (2006), and the extant Charmley *et al.* (2016) and Escobar-Bahamondes *et al.* (2017) equations. The gray and black solid lines represent the fitted regression line for the relationship between observed and predicted values, and the identity line ($y = x$), respectively.

Figure 2. Observed vs. predicted plots for higher-forage methane emission ($\text{g d}^{-1} \text{ animal}^{-1}$) prediction equations for the different categories, viz., dry matter intake (DMI_C), dry matter intake and neutral detergent fiber (DMI+NDF_C), dry matter intake and starch (DMI+STA_C), dry matter intake and ether extract (DMI+EE_C), diet (Diet_C), animal (Animal_C), animal without DMI (Animal_no_DMI_C), GLOBAL NETWORK Tier 2, IPCC Tier 2 (2006), and the extant Charmley *et al.* (2016) and Escobar-Bahamondes *et al.* (2017) equations. The gray and black solid lines represent the fitted regression line for the relationship between observed and predicted values, and the identity line ($y = x$), respectively.

Figure 3. Observed vs. predicted plots for lower-forage methane emission ($\text{g d}^{-1} \text{ animal}^{-1}$) prediction equations for the different categories, viz., dry matter intake (DMI_C), dry matter intake and neutral detergent fiber (DMI+NDF_C), dry matter intake and starch (DMI+STA_C), dry matter intake and ether extract (DMI+EE_C), GLOBAL NETWORK Tier 2, IPCC Tier 2 (2006), and the extant Ellis *et al.* (2009) equations. The gray and black solid lines represent the

fitted regression line for the relationship between observed and predicted values, and the identity line ($y = x$), respectively.

Figure 4. Observed vs. predicted plots for European higher-forage methane emission ($\text{g d}^{-1} \text{ animal}^{-1}$) prediction equations for the different categories, viz., dry matter intake (DMI_C), dry matter intake and neutral detergent fiber (DMI+NDF_C), dry matter intake and starch (DMI+STA_C), dry matter intake and ether extract (DMI+EE_C), dietary (Diet_C), animal (Animal_C), animal without DMI (Animal_no_DMI_C), global (Global_C), GLOBAL NETWORK Tier 2, and IPCC Tier 2 (2006), and the extant Charmley *et al.* (2016) and Escobar-Bahamondes *et al.* (2017) equations. The gray and black solid lines represent the fitted regression line for the relationship between observed and predicted values, and the identity line ($y = x$), respectively.

Figure 5. Observed vs. predicted plots for North American higher-forage methane emission ($\text{g d}^{-1} \text{ animal}^{-1}$) prediction equations for the different categories, viz., dry matter intake (DMI_C), dry matter intake and neutral detergent fiber (DMI+NDF_C), dry matter intake and starch (DMI+STA_C), dry matter intake and ether extract (DMI+EE_C), dietary (Diet_C), animal (Animal_C), animal without DMI (Animal_no_DMI_C), global (Global_C), GLOBAL NETWORK Tier 2 (2006), IPCC Tier 2 (2006), and the extant Charmley *et al.* (2016) equation. The gray and black solid lines represent the fitted regression line for the relationship between observed and predicted values, and the identity line ($y = x$), respectively.